THE TEXTUAL AFFINITY OF THE EARLIEST COPTIC MANUSCRIPTS OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

by

Rufus Ledford Moretz

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: October 14, 1968

Approved:

Kenneth W. Clark
Kenneth W. Clark, Supervisor

Wm. F. Stinespring

James L. Price

Orval Wintermute

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the Department of Religion
in the Graduate School of Arts and
Sciences of Duke University

1968

ABSTRACT

(Religion--Biblical Studies)

THE TEXTUAL AFFINITY OF THE EARLIEST COPTIC MANUSCRIPTS OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

by

Rufus Ledford Moretz

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: October 14, 1968

Approved:

Kenneth W. Clark
Kenneth W. Clark, Supervisor

Wm. F. Stinespring

James L. Price

Orval Wintermute

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of
Religion in the Graduate School of Arts
and Sciences of Duke University

1968

ARCHIVES
PH.D.
M845T
1969

ABSTRACT

THE TEXTUAL AFFINITY OF THE EARLIEST COPTIC MANUSCRIPTS OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Rufus Ledford Moretz

The starting point for this investigation was the belief that a collation of the most ancient Coptic manuscripts of John against the earliest Greek texts of John including the most recent acquisitions, P^{66} and P^{75}, might reveal new insights for better reconstructing the earliest history of the text of the New Testament. The three Coptic manuscripts used in the study are by virtue of date and amount of surviving text the most suitable available for this kind of investigation. They are Papyrus Bodmer III (BO) in Bohairic, edited by Rodolphe Kasser; the sub-Achmimic text of John edited by Herbert Thompson (A); and the University of Michigan Fayumic text of John edited by Elinor M. Husselman (F). Because of the dearth of research into the relationship between the Greek and Coptic languages, a large portion of this study concerns itself with explicating correspondences

in construction between the two languages, with a view to distinguishing recognizable sense variants. Preliminary attempts to collate Greek and Coptic texts against each other demonstrated the indispensability of this kind of study. In spite of the fact that Greek and Coptic are descended from different language families, detailed comparison of the extensive Coptic texts used in the study with the Greek _textus receptus_ revealed consistent use of given Coptic constructions to translate the various individual Greek constructions.

The results of the study show that although in many cases the Coptic can clearly reflect support for one of several differing Greek texts, in many other cases the nature of the Coptic language prevents the assignment of the Coptic text to the support of one over against another of the Greek texts. The study makes it clear that where the Coptic has a future tense, no distinction can be made on the basis of the Coptic between a Greek future or subjunctive and a Greek futuristic present. Similarly, where Coptic has some form of imperfect or perfect, no distinction can be made between a Greek aorist or imperfect and a historical present. The same holds true for the Greek aorist and perfect where Coptic has the I or II perfect, and between the Greek present and perfect where Coptic has a present. Although the Coptic normally distinguishes between the Greek aorist and imperfect, the tense usage vacillates to such an extent where verbs with stative qualities (for example, "believe") or verbs of "asking" or "saying" are involved, that in these cases no sense distinction can be claimed. For the same reason, distinctions cannot be made on the basis of the Coptic between a Greek finite tense and a verbal participle, between a periphrastic construction with ειμι and a simple tense form, or between a subjunctive purpose clause and a purposive infinitive. Finally, the Coptic permits a judgment regarding the underlying Greek connective particles in only a few cases, between the use or non-use of the Greek article in almost no instances, and in the use or non-use of the possessive pronoun only where the Coptic omits one which appears in the Greek.

The composite collation made on the basis of these studies of Greek and Coptic construction demonstrates that, considering only those cases where the Coptic can be shown to support one or another of the Greek texts, all three Coptic manuscripts are, among the early Greek witnesses, relatively closest to P^{75} and B and most distant from D. On the basis of somewhat ambiguous evidence, the Coptic texts can tentatively be placed chronologically and textually between P^{75} and B. Such placement supports the view that sees Codex Vaticanus emerging at the latter end of a line of gradual textual transmission retraceable to the second century rather than as the result of a deliberate textual revision. Furthermore, the fact that A and BO are almost equally near P^{75} and B indicates that in spite of broad differences between them, these two Coptic manuscripts may have a common ancestry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the following persons, the members of the committee which has guided my graduate program and advised me during the course of this dissertation project: Professors Kenneth W. Clark, James L. Price, Jr., Robert S. Rogers (deceased), William F. Stinespring, William H. Willis, and Orval S. Wintermute. I am especially appreciative of the efforts of Dr. Clark, the chairman of my committee, and of Dr. Wintermute, both of whom have given large segments of their time to aiding and advising me in the course of the work. I am also appreciative of the financial support extended me during my work on this project by the Gurney Harriss Kearns Foundation in the form of a Kearns Fellowship for the year 1967-1968. Finally, I express my thanks to Miss Ruby Bailey, who typed the final draft of the work, and to my wife for countless labors in behalf of the project, not the least of which was the typing of the original draft and the compiling of the index of verse references in Chapter II.

R. L. M.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vii

INTRODUCTION 2

CHAPTER

I. THE COPTIC VERSIONS: THEIR DATE AND RELATIONSHIP TO EACH OTHER 19

II. A COMPARISON OF GREEK AND COPTIC CONSTRUCTION 34

III. THE RELATIONSHIP OF A, BO, AND F TO THE EARLY GREEK MANUSCRIPTS 171

APPENDIX I. THE COMPOSITE COLLATION 189

APPENDIX II. INDEX OF VERSE REFERENCES IN CHAPTER II 300

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 308

THE TEXTUAL AFFINITY OF THE EARLIEST COPTIC MANUSCRIPTS OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

INTRODUCTION

Since the publication in 1881 of the Westcott-Hort text of the New Testament, the dominance of the text of the two manuscripts Vaticanus and Sinaiticus has been virtually unchallenged. Not all scholars, however, have been satisfied with the view of Westcott and Hort that the separate ancestries of the two fourth-century manuscripts converge at some point near the beginning or prior to the second century.[1] Nor have all been willing to accept the view that Vaticanus, the more highly regarded of the two manuscripts, preserves "not only a very ancient text, but a very pure line of very ancient text."[2] On the contrary, some have held that Vaticanus represents a deliberate revision of older texts. G. D. Kilpatrick, for example, expressed the view that the Alexandrian text (including

---

[1] Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort (eds.), *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction and Appendix* (London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1881), p. 223.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 250 f.

Vaticanus) is a revised text which cannot be traced back beyond the third century.[1] The discovery within the last fifteen years of two additional, even more ancient texts on papyrus has changed the situation with regard to the history of the text. The first of these manuscripts to be published, P^{66}, contains most of John 1-14 with considerable fragments of 15-21 and is dated by its editors about A.D. 200.[2] The second, P^{75}, contains most of Luke 3-24 and John 1-15 and has been dated by its editors between A.D. 175 and 225.[3] It seems clear that the solution to the problem of the history of the text still lies in the investigation of the background of the Vaticanus-Sinaiticus text.[4] On the other hand, especially with regard to the Gospel of John where most of the first fourteen chapters are preserved in both P^{66} and

---

1. "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts," The Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV (1943), 35. Cf. also F. G. Kenyon, "Hesychius and the Text of the New Testament," Mémorial Lagrange (1940), pp. 249 f.

2. Victor Martin (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer II (Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956), p. 17.

3. Victor Martin and Rodolphe Kasser (eds.), Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV (Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961), p. 13.

4. Cf. A. F. J. Klijn, "Papyrus Bodmer II (John I-XIV) and the Text of Egypt," New Testament Studies, III (1957), 328.

P^{75}, that history must now be sought in intensive investigation of the textual character of these two most ancient witnesses.[1]

The starting point of the present investigation lies in the questions raised by a number of observations regarding P^{66} and P^{75}. These observations may be summarized as follows:[2] (1) P^{66} and P^{75} differ frequently in text despite a kindred origin in time and place; (2) the texts of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus show no consistent dependency on either P^{66} or P^{75}, but on the contrary, each agrees now with one, now with the other; (3) the textual affinity between P^{75} and Vaticanus is closer than that of any other pair among the earliest witnesses; (4) similarly, P^{66} has a strong affinity in some portions with the text of Sinaiticus. The close relation discerned between P^{75} and Vaticanus has already led one investigator to conclude that the contention that Vaticanus

---

1. It is well, however, to keep in mind the caution stated by G. D. Kilpatrick in "The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection of Biblical and Christian Texts," Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies, IV (1963), 41 f. He notes that scholars should not be swept off their feet merely by the age of these manuscripts. On the contrary, if the climate of Italy were as conducive to preserving documents as that of Egypt, we might today have second-century manuscripts with texts similar to that of Codex Bezae.

2. See Kenneth W. Clark, "The Text of the Gospel of John in Third-Century Egypt," Novum Testamentum, V (1962), 24.

represents a conscious fourth-century revision can no longer be held.[1] The desire for answers to the questions raised by the textual characteristics of P^{66} and P^{75} led the present investigator to pose the question whether a new collation of the Egyptian version, the Coptic, against the early Greek manuscripts including P^{66} and P^{75} might not yield new insights for reconstructing the history of the text. A search of Coptic bibliographical materials[2] and manuscript lists[3] led to the discovery that there are available only three Coptic manuscripts which by virtue of length and date are likely instruments for contributing such insights.[1]

---

[1] Calvin L. Porter, "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P^{75}) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXI (1962), 367.

[2] Among the available sources for Coptic bibliography are W. Kammerer, A Coptic Bibliography (Ann Arbor, Mich.: The University of Michigan, 1950); the bibliographies of J. Simon dealing with materials from 1940 forward, published periodically in Orientalia, beginning in 1949; the bibliographies published in Aegyptus; the textual section of the bibliographies presented in Biblica; and the extensive bibliography published in A. Mallon, Grammaire copte (4th ed. rev.; Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1956), pp. 254-398.

[3] An early list of Coptic materials in the libraries of the world was compiled by H. Hyvernat in "Etude sur les versions coptes de la Bible," Revue biblique, V (1896), 427-433, 540-569; VI (1897), 48-74. A descriptive list of all published Coptic Biblical materials was compiled by A. Vaschalde between 1919 and 1933. For the Sahidic see "Ce qui a été publié des versions coptes de la Bible," Revue biblique, XXVIII (1919), 220-243, 513-531; XXIX (1920), 91-106, 241-258; XXX (1921), 237-246; XXXI (1922), 81-88, 234-258. See Le Muséon, XLIII (1930), 409-431; XLV (1932), 117-156 for the Bohairic; and XLVI (1933), 299-313 for the Fayumic and Achmimic. An attempt was made by Walter Till in 1959 to bring this list up to date in "Coptic Biblical Texts Published after

The manuscripts selected for our study have been published in the following editions: Herbert Thompson (ed.), The Gospel of St. John according to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1924); Rodolphe Kasser (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer III: Évangile de Jean et Genèse I-IV, 2 ("Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium: Scriptores Coptici," vols. XXV-XXVI; Louvain:

Vaschalde's Lists," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XLII (1959), 220-240. A list of libraries, public and private, which contain Coptic materials was published by J. Simon in "Repertoire des bibliotheques publiques et privées contenant des manuscripts coptes," Le Muséon, XLIV (1931), 137-151. An excellent descriptive summary of available manuscripts of John in all dialects is provided by Rodolphe Kasser, L'Évangile selon saint Jean et les versions coptes (Neuchatel, Suisse: Delachaux et Niestle, 1966), pp. 28 ff.

[1] Because of the relative lateness of the manuscripts used and the fact that the text was pieced together from a large number of fragments, the critical text of G. W. Horner, The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect (7 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1911-1924) is of little use in the present investigation. Similarly, because of the lateness of the manuscripts underlying Horner's Bohairic text, The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect (4 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1898-1905), this edition also has little usefulness for the present research.

Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1958); Elinor M. Husselman (ed.), The Gospel of John in Fayumic Coptic (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, 1962).[1] For complete descriptions of the manuscripts one may consult the editors' introductions to the published editions of the texts. A useful summary gleaned from the editors' descriptions is presented below.

A

This manuscript, designated Q by its editor, was unearthed in March, 1923, by a team from the British School of Archaeology in Egypt in a broken crock at Qua el Kebir. It is now located in the library of the British and Foreign Bible Societies, London.

The manuscript is a codex of forty-three papyrus leaves which survive from an original of probably fifty leaves. The text begins at 2:12 and ends at 20:27. Within the codex pages ⲓⲁ and ⲓⲃ (3:22-4:5) and ⲗⲅ and ⲗⲇ (7:11-28) are lost. A single hand appears throughout. All of the pages are numbered. The papyrus fibers are laid in such a way that on pages 7-50 the vertical fibers are on the recto and the horizontal are on the verso. Pages 51-96 have the horizontal fibers on the recto and the vertical fibers on the verso. Thus, pages 50 and 51 both have horizontal fibers and originally were a single sheet. The codex was constructed by placing twenty-five sheets with horizontal fibers up, one on top of the other, and then folding the resulting single quire in half.

---

[1] Hereafter the following abbreviations will be used for the texts: A = Thompson sub-Achmimic; BO = Bodmer Bohairic; F = Michigan Fayumic.

The unfolded sheets of papyrus measured about 250 mm. square, and so the pages of the finished codex measure about 250 mm. by 125 mm. The text written upon these pages in a single column covers an area measuring about 210 mm. by 85 mm. This amounts to between thirty-three and thirty-seven lines per page with the number of letters per line varying between eleven and twenty-five.

There is no division in the text and, with the exception of the high point, a possible colon in one place (page 9, line 1), and the apostrophe, there is no punctuation. Supralineation for ⲛ at the end of the line never appears. $\overline{\text{ⲓⲏⲥ}}$, $\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$, $\overline{\text{ⲡⲛⲁ}}$ are the only contractions used.

Kenyon, at the solicitation of the editor, compared the hand with that of Vaticanus. He observed in A the "same simplicity, the same rounded forms, the same slight irregularities in length of lines . . . , and a very similar general appearance."[1] These observations led Kenyon to date A in the third quarter of the fourth century, about a quarter of a century later than Vaticanus. A subsequent examination of the manuscript led Victor Stegemann to attribute A to the end of the third century.[2] There are few criteria by which one may judge one or either of these dates to be accurate. The caveat expressed by some regarding the dating of Coptic manuscripts on the basis of Greek paleography deserves strong consideration.[3] Nevertheless, in view of Kenyon's statement that the script is so like the normal Greek hands that one may feel more than usual confidence in assigning a date and in view of the use of the single-quire construction most often found between the second and fourth centuries,[4] it seems reasonable to assign a date no later than the fourth century.

The dialect of A may be termed sub-Achmimic. That is to say, in the terms of the editor, it is consonantally Sahidic with a vocalization closely resembling Achmimic.

---

[1] Thompson, p. XII.

[2] _Koptische_ _Paläographie_ (Heidelberg, 1936), pp. 8b, 12b.

[3] See Husselman, p. 9, and J. Simon, "Le Dossier des texts subakhmimiques," _Le_ _Muséon_, LIX (1946), 501.

[4] Husselman, p. 9.

The editor believes that the manuscript presents the Sahidic version. He observes that except for fairly numerous differences of reading, and taking into account the dialect differences and a few vocabulary substitutions, the text of A is word for word that of the later Sahidic manuscripts.[1] The text is generally allied to a Greek text of the Vaticanus-Sinaiticus type. In places where Vaticanus and Sinaiticus differ, Thompson observes (p. XXI) that A supports Vaticanus about twice as often as it does Sinaiticus.[2] Because the studies of Thompson allow us at the outset to place A among the Egyptian witnesses more precisely than is possible with regard to the more recently discovered Bodmer III, we have selected A as the basic text for our collations of the manuscripts (see below p. 38).

BO

Papyrus Bodmer III, a codex originally containing the book of John and Genesis 1-4:2 was part of the group of documents in Greek and Coptic acquired by the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana in Genève. The papyrus is presently housed in this library. The exact provenance of the papyrus is not known. It is believed that it and the others acquired with it came from somewhere in Upper Egypt.

---

[1] Thompson, p. XXI.

[2] *Ibid*., p. XXVI.

The beginning of the papyrus is damaged so that, except for fragments, the text of John 1-4:12 is lost. The text of the rest of chapter 4 and part of 5 is at times fragmentary but becomes progressively better. The remainder of the papyrus is in good condition. The original probably consisted of seven quires of six sheets laid one upon the other so that the papyrus fibers in the completed codex appeared according to the pattern horizontal, vertical; vertical, horizontal. Each quire thus contained twelve folios. The quires, which were sewn at two points, show no sign of signature either at beginning or end. Except for the fact that the next to last folio (recto) has three lines of writing, the first and last two folios of the codex were left blank. The codex was furnished with a board-like covering constructed from a kind of quire of twenty-four pages of reused papyrus inscribed with cursive Greek. This writing has been rendered illegible by the glue used to bind the pages together. The interior face of the cover was glued to the first and last of the blank pages. Two bands of parchment about four by forty mm. showing traces of Coptic writing were placed in the middle of each quire in order to protect the codex at the point of greatest wear.

The pages measure 16.5 by 23.25 cm. The text occupies a space measuring 12.25 by 16.25 cm. The number of lines to a page generally runs to 22, 23, or 24. Some pages have 20, 21, or 25, and a few run as low as 18 or as high as 26. Over half the lines contain between 20 and 22 letters. In extreme cases the number runs as high as 30 and as low as 3. The pagination, in the hand of the scribe, exhibits a number of errors.

On the verso of folio 28, page ⲛⲅ, a change in style of writing is observable.[1] In contrast to the rest of the codex the lines are all the same length. The writing is smaller and more compressed. The orthography is more correct than in the rest of the codex, and according to the editor, resembles the script of medieval manuscripts.[2]

The writing is a relatively regular upright uncial script. On the basis of paleography the editor tentatively assigns a fourth-century date to the codex. The present writer knows of no published challenge to this dating. There are no divisions in the text although the forked line used to mark the beginning of paragraphs occurs sporadically in the middle of lines. Except for a medium-high point on the otherwise unique page ⲛⲅ, the only mark of punctuation used is the apostrophe. A stroke is extended over proper names and the nomina sacra. The letter ⲓ usually has a single point but occasionally appears with the dieresis.

---

[1] As the editor observes, this page encompasses that portion of text where the pericope adulterae is traditionally found.

[2] Why a single page should be inscribed in a different hand is a mystery.

There are many corrections made in a variety of ways.[1] Most of these corrections were apparently made by the scribe in the course of his work. There are numerous errors of dittography and haplography which have not been corrected.[2]

The dialect of BO may be termed Bohairic, but the manuscript exhibits many departures from the other Bohairic texts which are known. Among these departures are the use of ϩ along with the usual Bohairic form ϧ; the frequent use of ⲡ, ⲕ, and ⲧ in both aspirated and unaspirated form; the substitution of ϫ for ϭ at the beginning of a word; the use of pure

---

[1] See Kasser, Papyrus Bodmer III, p. VI.

[2] The large number of errors leads Kasser, Papyrus Bodmer III, pp. VII f., to surmise that the codex is not the work of a scriptorium, but is rather a private copy.

Sahidic forms (for example, ⲕⲟⲩⲓ, ⲱⲗ). A number of constructions appear in hybrid form: ⲉⲓⲛⲓ for Sahidic ⲉⲓⲛⲉ, Bohairic ⲓⲛⲓ; ϥⲇ for Sahidic ϥⲧⲟⲟⲩ, Bohairic ⲇ. These and other anomalies lead Kasser (p. XII) to suppose that the text has been translated from a Sahidic-type model into Bohairic by someone who did not know the orthography well.

The precise relation of the text of BO to the early Greek witnesses is yet to be determined. The editor of the text observes that preliminary examination shows that BO frequently agrees with the Bohairic version preserved in the mass of later manuscripts, but also frequently agrees with the Sahidic version and A against the Bohairic version.

F

Michigan papyrus Invoice 3521 was received in October, 1926, by the University of Michigan in a collection of miscellaneous papyri purchased in Egypt in 1925. The manuscript is a group of fragments of deeply discolored papyrus with very faint writing upon them. All but six of the fragments have been identified by the editor. The unidentified portions contain a negligible amount of writing. Although none is complete, most being broken off at the bottom, twenty-nine folios are represented. By comparing the edges of the leaves, the directions of the fibers, and the text inscribed in order to match originally united sheets, the editor of the text pieces together a tentative reconstruction which shows a codex originally formed by folding not less than forty-six sheets into a single quire containing not less than ninety-two folios. The usual pattern of laying all the sheets with the horizontal fibers facing up was not followed. The direction of the fibers was thus quite haphazard. Of the twenty-nine extant folios, the editor reckons that the two which she orders twentieth and twenty-first formed the conjugate folios of the middle spread of the quire and the codex. The text preserved by the fragments runs from the last few words of 6:11 through the first few of 15:11. In between there are many, often extensive lacunae.

Because of the fragmentary nature of the manuscript a precise measurement of the pages is impossible. The editor calculates that the original pages must have measured roughly 18.5 by 12 cm. The space covered by the writing is not consistent. The left margin varies between 1.5 and 2.5 cm. in width. As the number of letters on a line varies between eleven and twenty-two, the right margin is irregular. The upper and lower margins also vary. The number of lines to a page, when it can be determined, runs from as few as fifteen to as many as twenty. The amount of text per folio appears to increase in the later leaves, perhaps, as the editor suggests,[1] because the scribe was concerned about having sufficient space for the entire book.

The supralineation is sometimes a straight line, sometimes curved. It almost never extends over two consonants, but is sometimes between the letters, sometimes over the second letter, or even to the right of it. The dieresis is placed over the ⲓ when it follows another vowel and is generally used with the initial ⲓ.

The hand is a neat, regular uncial. Most of the letters are of uniform height, but ⲗ, ⲣ, ⲩ, and ϥ occasionally extend below the line. The editor suggests that F bears great resemblance in individual letters and general character to a papyrus codex in the British Museum (Or. 7594) which contains Deuteronomy, Jonah, and Acts. This resemblance is important because the British Museum codex is enclosed in a binding incorporating fragments of Greek papyrus documents which on paleographical grounds and on the basis of internal evidence may be dated in the late third or early fourth century. In addition, at the end of Acts a Coptic colophon written in a cursive Greek hand has been dated by Kenyon as not later than the middle of the fourth century. The Michigan papyrus, in the view of its editor,[1] must with the British Museum codex be dated in the early part of the fourth century.

---

[1] Husselman, p. 3.

The editor, noting that the dialect of F is closer to the later standardized Fayumic than to Sahidic or Bohairic, prefers to designate the dialect of F Fayumic.[2] She cites the following vowel changes found in the codex which are normally associated with the Fayumic dialect: ⲉ for ⲁ; ⲓ for final ⲉ; ⲁ for ⲟ; ⲏ for final ⲉ; ⲉⲓ for final ⲉ and ⲁ; ⲓ for ⲉⲓ. Other normally Fayumic features are the failure to write out numbers; ⲁ instead of Sahidic ⲉ in verb prefixes. The perfect prefix, however, is ϩⲁ. The usual Fayumic substitution of ⲗ for ⲣ does not occur except possibly in 6:66.

No comparison of this manuscript with a Fayumic version is possible, since the only published Fayumic text of John which parallels F at any point has only 9:24 in common with it. On the basis of a collation against the Sahidic and Bohairic versions preserved in the later manuscripts and against A and BO, the editor concludes that the translator of F had at hand both the Sahidic and Bohairic versions and, according to his own preference, followed now one, now the other. A comprehensive assessment of the relation of the text to the early Greek manuscripts has yet to be made.

---

[1] Husselman, p. 9.

[2] Paul Kahle in Bala'izah: Coptic Texts from Deir El-Bala'izah in Upper Egypt (2 vols.; London: Oxford University Press, 1954), I, 224 f. prefers to designate the dialect of the manuscript as Middle Egyptian with Fayumic influence.

The description of our three manuscripts has shown a fourth-century date for each one. We must next examine two problems: the date of the first translations into Coptic and the relation of the Coptic versions to each other.

Chapter I

THE COPTIC VERSIONS: THEIR DATE AND RELATIONSHIP TO EACH OTHER

The importance of the Coptic versions for the textual criticism of the New Testament lies first of all in their presumed chronological proximity to the earliest copies of the original Greek text. Consequently, the question of how near in time the earliest translation of these versions was to the original Greek is of crucial importance. Of parallel importance to the textual critic is the question of the relation of the various dialect versions to each other.

The Date of the Coptic Version

Unfortunately, the evidence is such that no unequivocal answer can be given to the question of the date of the Coptic version. As the survey presented by Bruce Metzger in *New Testament Manuscript Studies* shows,[1] the dates assigned by scholars for the Sahidic version range between the second and fourth centuries. An earlier view which assigned the Bohairic version to the second century was modified by later scholars so that a date as late as the eighth century was widely accepted.[2] More recently, with the acquisition of new manuscript evidence, notably Papyrus Bodmer III, such a late date appears untenable.

Arthur Vööbus argues forcefully for a third-century date for the Sahidic version.[3] He points to Athanasius' report concerning Anthony's decision to undertake the monastic life.[4] According to this report it was as a result of hearing a portion of Matthew (19:21) read (αναγινωσκω) in his native tongue (Sahidic) that Anthony decided to take up the life of an anchorite. Although Vööbus acknowledges that this report cannot be accepted uncritically, he believes that it provides some support for a Coptic translation of Matthew, at least, as early as A.D. 270. Vööbus arrives at a similar conclusion when he considers the rule given by Pachomius in 321 that all aspirants to the monastic life should be able to read twenty Psalms, two epistles, or a portion from any other part of the Scriptures.[1] As Vööbus suggests, the notion that this rule might refer to a reading of Greek texts is out of the question. This required reading would, of course, have been from the same language as the Rules themselves (Sahidic) and would presuppose a time when the reading of Biblical books in Coptic was no longer an innovation.[2] Although Vööbus, then, accepts a third-century date for the Sahidic, he would place the burden of proof on anyone who would adopt a second-century date. In recent opinion a third-century date for the Sahidic version was also accepted by Paul Kahle (I, 260 ff.) whose view has been accepted by Kilpatrick.[3]

---

[1] Merrill M. Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren (eds.), (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950), p. 36.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Early Versions of the New Testament* (Stockholm, 1954), pp. 220 ff.

[4] *Vita Antonii* 2. Anthony was born about the middle of the third century, and this decision was made when he was about twenty years old.

If, in contrast to Kahle (I, 262 f.), greater weight should be given to manuscript dating on the basis of Coptic

---

1. Only fragments of the Coptic original of the rules of Pachomius survive. Jerome made a Latin translation from a Greek version of the rules. See Regulae Pachomii 140.

2. Vööbus, p. 222.

3. Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies, IV (1963), 41.

supported by Greek paleography, the evidence of a recently discovered Sahidic manuscript might incline one toward a second-century date for the Sahidic version. This manuscript, described by Professor William H. Willis,[1] contains a homily on the Passion by Melito of Sardis, the text of II Maccabees 5:27-7:41, the text of I Peter, and the text of Jonah. Professor Willis dates the codex in the third century.[2] If this manuscript, perhaps several copies away from its archetype, is to be dated in the third century, it seems likely that translations of the Gospels would antedate it perhaps as far back as the end of the second century.

Until recently, the problem in setting an early date for the Bohairic version was that, as Kasser has put it,[3] we possessed no literary documents in Bohairic prior in date to the ninth century except for a short fragment edited by Husselman in 1947.[4] With the publication of Bodmer III this situation is changed. Now we possess a document, dated by Kasser in the fourth century,[1] which preserves almost ninety per cent of the Gospel of John in Bohairic.

---

[1] "The New Collections of Papyri at the University of Mississippi," Proceedings of the IX International Congress of Papyrology (1961), pp. 383 ff.

[2] Interestingly, like A and F, this is a single-quire codex. See Willis, p. 383.

[3] Papyrus Bodmer III, p. I.

[4] According to Vööbus, p. 232, this document is a school exercise book consisting of a single quire of eight folios

For both Sahidic and Bohairic, then, the question is no longer early or late, but rather how early. Kasser has attempted an extensive reconstruction which puts both versions quite early.[2] Kasser begins with the fact that there are numerous Coptic manuscripts which may be dated early in the fourth century. These manuscripts, written in Sahidic and the minor dialects, all witness generally a single text which may be called the Classical Sahidic version. They probably represent a translation in general use throughout the Church. Kasser theorizes that if we have this body of manuscripts which are to be dated within the fourth century, we may reasonably assume a date for the origin of the Classical Sahidic version in the second half of the third century.

---

containing eleven verses of Romans and one verse of Job in Bohairic. Vööbus notes that the fourth-century date claimed by Husselman is disputed, and that it may be much later. In addition to this fragment, Kahle, I, 274, cites a parchment fragment of Philemon written in semi-Bohairic and dated in the fourth or fifth century.

[1] Papyrus Bodmer III, p. I.

[2] L'Évangile selon saint Jean, pp. 15 ff.

Kasser is perhaps supported in this contention by the evidence cited above from Vööbus. Kasser goes on, however, to posit two earlier periods in the development of the text. He assumes that certain early manuscripts which witness a text differing from the Classical Sahidic version (for example, Bodmer III) probably represent an earlier text. Thus, one may assume a pre-Classical-Sahidic stage which may roughly be dated in the first half of the third century. The texts witnessing this stage would represent locally used translations. Then finally, one may assume a period roughly covering the second half of the second century when the first written translations, not now extant, would have been made. Kasser envisions the earliest practice whereby those persons not understanding Greek would have had the Greek text translated and explained to them orally in their own dialect. The earliest written translations would then have been short portions of text based on the stenographic efforts of new converts to preserve portions for the edification of their friends.[1]

That there would have been such a time when the texts were orally translated from the Greek into Coptic seems a logical assumption. Till observes that such a translation for those not understanding Greek would have been in the colloquial language of the people.[1] He comments that the Egyptian literary language of the time, written in Demotic, was a traditional one imitating old prototypes and thus different from the spoken language to the extent that only persons with literary education understood it. Perhaps the writing down of the Scriptures from oral translations was partly responsible for the colloquial speech becoming a literary language.

---

[1] L'Évangile selon saint Jean, p. 16.

Whatever may be the logic for suggesting a period when oral translations were made, it is perhaps clear that the two earliest stages suggested by Kasser are highly conjectural. In the first place, we do not know precisely how pervasive the use of the Classical Sahidic text was. Consequently, we cannot know with any degree of certainty whether manuscripts contemporary with copies representing the Classical Sahidic but differing themselves from this text really represent an earlier text. On one hand, both texts may have arisen simultaneously and existed side by side with comparable authority.[2] On the other hand, a text which differs from the

---

[1] Walter C. Till, "Coptic and Its Value," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XL (1958), 231. See also Till, Koptische Grammatik (Saïdischer Dialect) (3rd ed. rev.; Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1966), pp. 29 ff.

[2] Cf. G. Garitte, review of Papyrus Bodmer III, ed. by Rodolphe Kasser, in Le Muséon, LXXIII (1960), 438.

Classical Sahidic may have arisen locally subsequent to the Classical Sahidic and existed alongside it.

Two other items complicate attempts to assign a second-century date for the first Coptic translations of New Testament texts. The first is the present limit of our knowledge of the rise of the Coptic language itself. So-called Old Coptic texts, expressing Egyptian speech by the use of Greek letters with additional Demotic signs, appear in a few magical texts which may be dated in the second[1] or late first century.[2] What part Christianity, or for that matter the gnostic communities, had in the early development of the language is not clear,[3] although the translation of the New Testament into Coptic must have had considerable influence at some point in the development.[4]

---

[1] Till, in Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XL (1958), 230.

[2] Kahle, I, 252.

[3] Cf. Kasser, L'Évangile selon saint Jean, pp. 14 ff.

[4] William H. Worrell in A Short Account of the Copts (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1945), p. 8, takes the view that the early development of written Coptic had nothing to do with the Christian movement. According to Kahle, I, 265 ff., Sahidic was essentially developed before the advent of Christianity and was influenced by Christianity mainly in the standardization of the dialect.

The second item is the uncertainty which surrounds our knowledge of the geographical distribution and relationship between the dialects. While it is generally assumed that Sahidic was the dialect of Upper Egypt, Kahle (I, 256 f.) followed by Kasser,[1] believes that Sahidic originally must have been the dialect of Alexandria.[2] Kahle (I, 256) argues that the greater use in Sahidic of Greek words and particles and especially the use of Greek verbs without ⲣ offers strong evidence that Sahidic was in closer contact with Greek than the other dialects. Kasser suggests that Sahidic probably spread throughout the land as a result of the movement of the Greek officials up and down the country.[3] The minor dialects were used locally fairly early in the history of the language in the regions from which their names are taken. What the relation was between the local dialects and Sahidic which apparently existed side by side with them cannot with confidence be determined. The early place of Bohairic in this picture is likewise puzzling. Kahle (I, 251) believes that originally Bohairic was a local sub-dialect used somewhere in the Delta. Worrell accepts the view that Bohairic arose in the Delta. He further suggests that as Bohairic was the only dialect which took over all the signs from Demotic which it needed and thus was the only dialect in contact with Demotic at the time of its literary fixation, it may be the oldest of the literary dialects.[1] Intensive study of recently acquired texts should enhance our knowledge of the relationship between the dialects and perhaps shed additional light on the date of the Coptic versions.

---

[1] Kasser, *L'Évangile selon saint Jean*, p. 11.

[2] William H. Worrell in *Coptic Sounds* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1934), p. 73, suggests that Sahidic originally may have been the dialect of Oxyrhynchus.

[3] *L'Évangile selon saint Jean*, p. 11.

If in view of the multiplicity of problems one cannot with any degree of certainty date the Coptic versions in the second century, one can with considerable confidence date them in the third century, with yet the strong possibility that they may have been translated both in Sahidic and Bohairic during the second century. At any rate, we have manuscript copies available in the specific document of our investigation, the Gospel of John, which represent texts that antedate the early Greek parchment uncials and which approach the time of P^{66} and P^{75}.

---

[1] Coptic Sounds, p. 67.

The Relationship of the Versions to Each Other

For the present investigation, next in importance to establishing an early date for the Coptic versions is the matter of the relation which the different Coptic versions have to each other. What, if anything, has been discovered to date about the relationship between the three manuscripts under consideration and what can be determined about the relationship of the three to other Coptic manuscripts?

With regard to A, in spite of a considerable number of differences, Thompson (p. XXI) believes that the manuscript is clearly a translation of the version attested by the bulk of the later Sahidic manuscripts. Kasser concurs in this opinion.[1] In fact, in the sixth and seventh chapters of John, Kasser compared general vocabulary, Egyptian words, certain conjunctions, and syntax between the Classical Sahidic, the Classical Bohairic, A, BO, and F, and came up with percentages of disagreement which seem rather strikingly to support the opinion that A renders some form of the Sahidic version.[2] The percentages are as follows: disagreement between Classical

---

[1] L'Évangile selon saint Jean, p. 62, n. I.

[2] See "Le Papyrus Bodmer III et les versions bibliques coptes," Le Muséon, LXXIV (1961), 426.

Sahidic and Classical Bohairic, 30%; between Classical Sahidic and BO, 35%; between Classical Bohairic and BO, 30%; but between Classical Sahidic and A, 2%.

Kasser, on the basis of only a 3% disagreement in the cases tested between the Classical Sahidic and F, would take the position that F too is a rendering of the Sahidic version.[1] While the percentages which Kasser presents point toward probable relationships they cannot be considered conclusive. In fact, as was noted above (p. 18), the editor of F, in opposition to Kasser, offers the tentative conclusion that since F has close verbal parallels in some cases with the Sahidic but in others with the Bohairic, the translator probably had both texts at hand and adapted his version from the two as he saw fit.[2] Husselman further notes that since F is close to A, the Sahidic text used by the translator was the type of Sahidic represented by A.[3]

While one may argue the degree of closeness which exists between A and the Classical Sahidic and between F and the Classical Sahidic, it seems clear that the two texts (A and F) are closely tied to the Classical Sahidic. They may be examples of the earliest form of that text, or as Kasser suggests,[1] they may reflect a period slightly later than the time of the Classical Sahidic when, during a systematic effort to evangelize all the country, translations were made into local dialects in order to reach persons who did not understand Sahidic adequately.

---

[1] See Le Muséon, LXXIV (1961), 426.

[2] Husselman, p. 18.

[3] Ibid.

The situation with regard to BO is even less clear. In the original edition of the text, Kasser advanced the hypothesis that BO was a translation into an approximate Bohairic from an archaic Sahidic model.[2] He adduced as evidence the following observations: known words appear in BO in previously unattested forms; BO employs three words which are not known at all in present lexicons; BO uses a form of negative conditional (ⲁⲛⲛⲉ-) which does not appear in any other text; BO uses the archaic past relative form ⲉⲣ.[3] None of these facts seems to weigh heavily in favor of dating the model of BO prior to the Classical Sahidic. One is not surprised that occasionally new texts of considerable length contain words or forms not previously known. Since the great

---

1. *L'Évangile selon saint Jean*, p. 20.

2. *Papyrus Bodmer III*, p. XII.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. XI f.

majority of Bohairic texts do not antedate the ninth century, very little evidence is available on which to judge what might have been the normative constructions of a fourth-century Bohairic. Thus, the presence of the strange negative conditional may not reflect a particularly ancient construction at all. The form may even have been simply a peculiarity of this one manuscript--possibly a joining of the interrogative ⲁⲛ with the negative third future (see below, p. 113). The presence of the ⲉⲣ relative certainly cannot be advanced in favor of dating the model of BO prior to that of A, since the same form also occurs in A. Garitte (p. 438), in his review of Kasser's original publication of the text, took note of the wide divergences of BO from both the Sahidic and Bohairic manuscripts and suggested that BO was an independent translation from the Greek. Subsequent to the publication of the text of BO, Kasser modified his view so that with Garitte he came to take the position that BO was an independent translation, "sans toutefois exclure toute possibilité de _relation_ entre notre papyrus [BO] et quelque texte archaïque de l'aire _sahidique_ (selon notre première hypothèse)."[1] Kasser concludes that BO is a partial source for the Classical

---

[1] _Le Muséon_, LXXIV (1961), 433.

Bohairic version.[1] So little is known at this point that it seems certain that further investigation will call for additional modification of these views.

With the problem of the date and relationship between the versions surveyed, we turn next to an examination of Greek and Coptic construction.

---

[1] In *Le Muséon*, LXXIV (1961), 433.

Chapter II

A COMPARISON OF GREEK AND COPTIC CONSTRUCTION

Because of widely differing characteristics of structure and syntax between Coptic and Greek, any effort to determine an underlying Greek text solely on the basis of the Coptic version of the Greek abounds with difficulties.[1] A comparison of extensive texts of both languages, however, allows an investigator to determine with varying degrees of probability what are the normative constructions in the two languages. Some constructions vary so widely from one language to the other that little comparison can be made between them. The word-order of an underlying Greek text, for example, cannot be determined on the basis of its Coptic translation.[2] Brief lists of correspondences and differences between the two languages have been provided by a number of scholars.[1] These lists are, however, so general in character and so sketchy in detail that they are of limited value in comparing the Greek and Coptic for text-critical purposes. Since the present investigation has had the advantage of extensive Coptic texts, it has been possible to compare the various forms of expression within individual manuscripts and, thereby, to form some judgment about the usual means of expressing given Greek forms within each Coptic manuscript. The procedure herein has been to compare our three Coptic

---

[1] Till, in Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XL (1958), 238.

[2] Cf. Kasser, L'Évangile selon saint Jean, p. 47; Allen Wikgren, "The Use of the Versions in New Testament Textual

---

Criticism," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII (1948), 138; James Hardy Ropes, The Acts of the Apostles, edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (5 vols.; "The Beginnings of Christianity"; London: Macmillan, 1926), III, 319.

[1] The most detailed description of the contrast between the two languages is provided with separate treatment for each of the two main dialects by Ropes, pp. 318 ff. and 358 ff. Similar, less extensive treatment may be found in J. Lagrange, Introduction à l'étude du Nouveau Testament: critique textuelle (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1935), pp. 315 ff.; in William Grossouw, The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets ("Monumenta Biblica et Ecclesiastica"; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1938), pp. 12 ff.; and in Hermann von Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments (2 vols., 2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1911), II, 1480 f. Further information is scattered through Alexander Böhlig, Untersuchungen über die koptischen Proverbientexte (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1936); Henry S. Gehman, "The Sahidic and the Bohairic Versions of the Book of Daniel," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVI (1927), 279 ff.; and J. Barton Payne, "Characteristics of Coptic Bible Translation," The Asbury Seminarian, V (1950), 64 ff.

texts with the Greek *textus receptus*,[1] not because the Coptic is closest to the TR, but because of the availability of collations of the most important early Greek manuscripts against the TR.[2]

The most promising area for this kind of investigation is the verb.[3] Unfortunately, because Greek and Coptic are descended from separate language families, the verbal constructions of Coptic differ radically from those of Greek. The Coptic verb, for example, does not possess tense in the sense with which we use the term in reference to English or other Indo-European languages. For the sake of convenience Coptic grammarians employ such tense designations as exist in their own languages to refer to the various Coptic verbal constructions. The use of these Coptic constructions in translating Greek follows patterns which are consistent enough to indicate correspondence with various Greek constructions even though the Greek and Coptic may not be equivalent. Although it is desirable to know what a given Coptic translation from Greek meant to the Coptic translator, it is sufficient for text-critical purposes to know whether a given Coptic translation can or cannot translate a given Greek text. If in an extensive text one can examine the Coptic practice in translating a given Greek tense, one can tentatively determine what is the normative handling by the Coptic of that tense. He may then seek to find explanation for the apparently anomalous translations of the given Greek tense. Such a procedure works well where the early Greek manuscripts bear unanimous witness to a given verb form. If in such instances the Coptic varies from its usual practice with regard to a given tense and no explanation is apparent, there is strong probability that the Coptic is based either on a Greek reading which no extant Greek manuscript witnesses, or else the scribe has given the text a new interpretation. Where the Greek witnesses disagree, it is sometimes possible on the basis of the usual Coptic practice to attribute the Coptic to one or the other of the readings. In other instances, for example, where the Coptic I future could represent either a Greek future or a futuristic present, it is not possible to attribute the Coptic to one reading to the exclusion of the other. Consequently, although it is often possible to determine with a high degree of probability when a Coptic text varies from a given Greek reading, Coptic support for a reading, even though it may be highly probable, must remain tentative in view of the possibility of the discovery of other readings which might differ but be equally possible. It is thus necessary with regard to any given tense to consider individually all deviations by the Coptic from its usual practice.

---

[1] η καινη διαθηκη (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1873). Hereafter the *textus receptus* is designated by the abbreviation TR.

[2] See Appendix in Calvin Lewis Porter, "A Textual Analysis of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the Gospel of John" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1961).

[3] A similar study using a very limited portion of text (Acts 6:8-7:60) has been made by Anton Joussen, *Die Koptischen Versionen der Apostelgeschichte* (Bonn: Published by the author, 1963).

In the present investigation the procedure has been to compare all the verbs in the Greek TR of John with the Coptic sub-Achmimic verbs which correspond. Subsequently, the variations from this sub-Achmimic found in the Fayumic and Bohairic texts have been noted and compared with the Greek. The resulting pattern of Coptic practices with regard to the various Greek tenses should provide some insight necessary for compiling a collation of Coptic readings which actually reflect a Greek text different from that of the TR. We proceed, then, to examine the Coptic practice with regard to each of the Greek tenses in turn--beginning with the indicative mood.[1]

---

[1] If the reader is to fully comprehend the following sections, constant reference to all the texts under consideration is required.

Greek Present Tense

1a It is quickly apparent on comparing the TR with A that the usual translation of the Greek present is the Coptic I present. This particular correspondence occurs over 250 times within the portion of John contained in A.

b The Coptic II present translates the Greek present about fifty times. In Coptic, the II present is a tense carrying the sense of action in the present with emphasis upon an adverbial element.[1] The II present, as a matter of fact, may indicate a different word-order in the Greek which it translates. Since, however, that word-order cannot reliably be recovered in most instances, the II present can be considered, in comparison with the Greek, indistinguishable from the I present.

c Although one grammarian suggests that its fundamental significance is that of a repetition of instantaneous past action,[2] the tense of habitude accurately translates a number of Greek presents which may be classified, using the terminology of Dana and Mantey,[1] as customary presents (3:20, 21; 4:9; 5:7; 7:4; 8:44, 47; 9:31^{2}; 10:3^{4}, 4^{2}, 10, 11, 12^{5}, 27; 11:9, 10; 12:24^{2}; 15:5 [lacuna in A but habitude in BO]; 16:21; 18:37).[2]

---

[1] See relevant portions of the standard grammars, or for the explanation at its source see H. J. Polotsky, _Études de syntaxe copte_ (Le Caire: Publications de la société d'archéologie copte, 1944), pp. 21 ff. See also Polotsky, "The Coptic Conjugation System," _Orientalia_, XXIX (1960), 407 ff.

[2] J. Martin Plumley, _An Introductory Coptic Grammar (Sahidic Dialect)_ (London: Home and van Thal., 1948), pp. 94 f.

2 There are a number of instances in which the Coptic, although it appears at first glance to vary from the Greek, is seen on further examination to be a possible legitimate
a interpretation of the Greek. Typical, in this regard, are most of the cases where the Greek present is rendered by a Coptic I future. In many instances in the Greek John a present tense may be interpreted either with customary sense or with future sense. One researcher who dealt extensively with the grammar of the Greek of the Gospel of John believed these cases should be interpreted as customary present action wherever the sense permitted.[3] The future, however, is possible in most of these cases, so a future

---

[1] H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 183.

[2] Verse references within and without parentheses indicate the location of the various phenomena described. Superscript numerals indicate the number of occurrences within the verse.

[3] Edwin A. Abbot, Johannine Grammar (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906), pp. 352 ff.

rendering in Coptic cannot be presumed to rest necessarily
on a Greek future. To be sure, in the following cases
where Greek does have a futuristic present, the Coptic I
future is an appropriate translation: 3:18; 4:36^{2}; 6:56;
7:27 (lacuna in A but future in BO), 33, 34, 36; 8:21^{1}, 22,
46; 11:8, 11, 47; 12:34, 47; 14:2, 17, 19 (lacuna in A but
future in BO), 28^{3}; 15:6^{3}; 16:10^{2}, 16 (omitted in A but future
b in BO), 17, 19, 22, 28^{1}; 19:10; 20:23. Five other verses
translate futuristic presents with the II future (6:9;
10:33; 11:31; 14:12; 16:5). This tense expresses a nuance
indistinguishable in Greek from that expressed by the
c I future. There is a second group of cases where the I
future does not, perhaps, translate the sense intended by
the original, but does translate appropriately a possible
interpretation of the Greek (5:4, 19, 21, 22; 8:35^{2}; 10:15,
d 17, 27, 28; 14:24; 15:2^{2}, 15; 20:17, 23). The ambiguity of
the situation is illustrated by the fact that BO translates
(in agreement with TR) 10:15, 17 with I present and 10:27
e with the tense of habitude. There remain two examples of
I future translating the Greek present which seem either
to interpret erroneously or to represent a different
Greek text (6:36; 16:26).

3a Other examples where apparent variation turns out rather to be appropriate interpretation are the Greek historical presents. In these instances (4:7, 47 [Greek perfect used as a present]; 5:14; 6:19; 9:13; 11:29^2, 38; 12:22^3; 13:4^2, 6, 26^2; 18:3, 28; 20:14, 18, 26) the Greek present is legitimately translated with a Coptic I perfect (in 13:29 by a II perfect, which, as far as comparison with Greek is concerned, is equivalent to the I perfect).

b In 15:3 ηδη . . . καθαροι εστε is translated by a Coptic I perfect with ηδη omitted. The past action of the Coptic seems to be a legitimate implication drawn from the Greek ηδη.

4 Verses 9:21, 23 provide a different kind of problem. In both verses ηλικιαν εχει is translated by the Coptic perfect ⲁϥⲣⲧⲉ. There is probably no Greek variant from the TR behind this Coptic idiom. It is probably simply the result of puzzlement on the part of the translator at the Greek idiom "to have age." The Coptic, literally "to make time or season," requires a past tense in order to parallel the Greek εχω.

5a A number of Coptic perfects translating Greek presents seem to be variants (5:43; 9:15; 11:39; 16:7, 30;

b 19:4). Of these, however, the perfect in 16:30 is an

anomalous translation of the perfect οιδα as a perfect rather than a present.[1] Although perfect in form, οιδα always is translated as a present in the Greek New Testament
c and in nearly fifty other cases in A. In 11:39 the translator is apparently led by the ηδη preceding οζει to use
d the I perfect. In 19:4 αγω is a perfective present and is thus suitably translated by the perfect.[2]

6 The Coptic "not yet" and "until" tenses provide some interesting situations vis-à-vis the Greek. In four cases the Greek present tense preceded by ουπω is rendered
a in Coptic by the "not yet" tense. In 7:6 and 8:57 the
b effect is a literally accurate translation. Verse 7:8 provides a slightly different situation. Here εγω ουπω αναβαινω is translated with Coptic "I am not yet intending to go" (ⲙⲡⲁϯⲛⲟⲩⲉ ⲁⲉ[ⲓ]). It would seem, however, that the futuristic sense of αναβαινω is faithfully interpreted by

---

[1] As is observed by F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and revised from the 9th and 10th edition by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 175 ff., the classical usage in which the perfect has the function of a present gives way in New Testament Greek to a usage of the perfect which combines in itself the present and the aorist.

[2] Ibid., p. 168.

c the Coptic verb "intend." A variant rendering seems to be present in the Coptic translation of 9:4. The Greek phrase εως ημερα εστιν· ερχεται νυξ is elliptical and obscure. The Coptic understandably interprets a clearer
d reading: "while it is day before night comes." The slight variation in the Coptic translation (literally "until what") of εως ποτε in 10:24 represents no real variant.[1]

7 An unexpected translation appears in 12:35. The Greek "yet a little time the light is with you" would lead one to expect a Coptic II present on account of the initial adverbial phrase. On the contrary, however, the Coptic translates "It is still another time which the light is with you." Although it seems unnecessarily cumbersome, the Greek phrase ετι μικρον χρονον, being without the article, could (if the translator believed χρονον to be neuter) be translated in a predicative sense with a following relative implied: "Still little is the time which the light is with you." Perhaps a more acceptable explanation as to why the translator has made the Greek main clause the subordinate one is that he is

---

[1] See W. E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1939), p. 468.

obeying usual Coptic practice in trying to avoid placing an adverbial phrase before the verb. He may be using this arrangement to duplicate the emphatic position of the Greek adverbial phrase. In any case, the Coptic surely arises out of the obliqueness of the TR Greek rather than from a variant Greek text.

8 The Greek present translated by Coptic imperfect requires close examination, because the Coptic imperfect
a prefix is easily confused with other structures. In 9:19 ⲛⲉ ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲡⲉ has the appearance of an imprefect, and in spite of the difficulty of apparently combining direct discourse with indirect, the editor of A translates it as an imperfect.[1] A less cumbersome explanation, however, is that
b ⲛⲉ functions as an interrogative particle. The only real example in A of an imperfect translating a Greek present occurs in 11:9. The Coptic in translation sounds awkward: "He does not stumble because he was seeing the light of this world." One is forced to the conclusion, suggested by the editor's footnote,[2] that here the scribe has erred.

---

1. Thompson, p. 60. In contrast with his translation, however, Thompson notes in a footnote (p. 18) that ϫⲉⲛⲉ stands for ϫⲉ ⲉⲛⲉ.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

9 Variants from the present tense of the Greek appear
a in several cases. In 14:8 a Coptic imperative replaces
b the present. In 3:8 a present is translated by a Coptic II
c perfect. In 6:63 λαλω is translated by a non-verbal with
relative perfect predicate (see sec. 10d for the non-verbal
construction).

10 The instances where a Greek present is translated
by some form of Coptic present relative may be conveniently
a grouped together. In translating the Greek καθως followed
by a present tense, Coptic employs the phrase "according
to the way which" with relative present (5:23,30; 10:15).
b Similarly in the translation of Greek ωσπερ the phrase "in
the way which" is used with the relative present (5:26)
c and relative habitude (5:21). Greek ουτω, ουτως followed
by a present tense is translated by a Coptic circumlocution
"according to the way which" followed by relative present
(12:50; 14:31). Perhaps the most distinctive use of the
Coptic relative present to translate a Greek simple
d present is its use as an emphatic structure. Frequently,
for the sake of emphasis, A has parallel to a simple Greek
present a non-verbal sentence with relative present
predicate (4:35; 6:30, 32, 61; 8:13, 28, 38; 9:27, 30;

10:18, 25; 13:18; 18:8, 21, 29, 37).[1] Such differences in
emphasis may be presumed to originate not with a differing
text, but rather with a differing interpretation on the
e part of the Coptic translator. In one instance (8:18) A
apparently de-emphasizes by translating εγω ειμι ο
μαρτυρων, a Greek equivalent to the Coptic emphatic
f structure just described, with a I present. There are
several cases where a Greek futuristic present is rendered
emphatically by a non-verbal sentence with a relative
future predicate. The future import of the Greek present
is clear in the case of the questions in 6:28, 60; 9:34;
11:47; 13:6.

11 The use of the Coptic relative is exceedingly
a complex, because it has such varied uses. In the use
described in the preceding section, where the relative
forms the predicate of a non-verbal sentence, the copula
πε frequently coalesces with the ετ of the relative to

---

[1] For the same phenomenon in Sahidic see Till, Koptische Grammatik, pp. 197 f. For comparison with the emphatic sense of the second tenses see Polotsky, Études de syntaxe copte, pp. 53 ff. Cf. also Polotsky, "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Koptischen," Orientalia, XXI (1962), 422 ff., and P. du Bourguet, "Quelques dérogations aux 'regles' de la grammaire copte," Bulletin de la société d'archéologie copte, XVII (1963-1964), 15 ff.

b produce the form ⲡⲉⲧ-. The form ⲡⲉⲧ- also appears in the
relative substantive, which is used, on one hand, to
translate Greek relative present clauses functioning as
subject or object of a verb (with Coptic relative present
3:11; 4:18, 22; 5:21; 11:3; 13:7; with relative future
translating a futuristic present relative 13:27; 15:14
c [lacuna in A but future in BO]). On the other hand, the
form is used to translate participles with the article
which are used in various substantive ways in the Greek
sentence (see sec. 16).

12 This problem is further compounded by the fact
that the Coptic relative is also used to translate both
Greek relative clauses used adjectivally and participles
used with adjectival force. In fact, these adjectival
relatives may have the same ⲡⲉⲧ- form used by the substantives.
Coptic adjectival relatives paralleling both
Greek relatives and participles occur either with or
a without the article. In A the relative appears most
frequently without the article as the translation of a
Greek adjectival relative (with ⲉⲧ relative: 3:2; 5:20,
32, 36; 7:3; 9:19; 10:25; 14:12, 24; 15:26; 16:15, 17, 18;

b with circumstantial relative: 6:9; 10:16).[1] An adjectival
relative with futuristic present is translated by an
c articleless relative future in 6:37. Perhaps it is in
parallel to the Greek attributive form ο ανθρωπος ο αγαθος,
that the Coptic relative does, however, translate Greek
adjectival relative clauses with the article-plus-relative
combination πετ-. A does not happen to have any examples
with the relative present, but the phenomenon occurs with
d the relative future (15:26) and perfect (12:9, 38). BO
provides examples of this phenomenon with the relative
present (15:26), with the relative perfect (5:36; 8:40;
e 17:6), and with the relative future (6:51; 14:26). The
same pattern paralleling a Greek attributive participle
occurs in A with relative future in 18:5 and in BO with a
f relative perfect in 6:51 and 11:45. The participle in
15:2 παν κλημα εν εμοι μη φερον καρπον is translated by A
with an article plus relative; by BO, without the article.
g The same kind of Greek participle in 10:12 is translated
h in A and BO by a relative without article. A similar
Greek expression in 9:11 is translated by A with the tense

---

[1] The circumstantial relative differs from the ετ-relative only in having an indefinite antecedent.

i of habitude without the article. One other type of
expression occurs. This structure, which Plumley (p. 178)
calls a descriptive relative, apparently paralleling the
Greek adjectival relative preceded by article, has the
demonstrative preceding the present relative (4:32; 6:42)
or relative habitude (9:7).

13 One other difficulty must be explored at this point.
As noted above, the Coptic relative without article preceding, most commonly translated the Greek adjectival rela-
a tive clause. In A and BO, however, the absence of the
article before the relative does not suffice to assure that
b the relative is adjectival. While in Sahidic, the non-
verbal with third-person subject and relative predicate
always has a copula,[1] this rule cannot be trusted in A and
BO. The context must determine whether the form ⲉⲧ- in ⲡⲉⲉⲓ
ⲉⲧ- is adjectival or the predicate of a non-verbal sentence.
c The query raised by Vergote,[2] whether the example cited by

---

[1] As in Sahidic if the subject of a non-verbal sentence is a first or second person pronoun the copula may (9:30) or may not (4:35; 8:13; 10:18; 13:18; 15:16; 18:37) be present. See J. Vergote, "La Phrase nominale en copte," Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute, II (1950), 240.

[2] Ibid., p. 242.

Till[1] from Achmimic of a non-verbal with third-person subject lacking the copula finds expression elsewhere, can be answered affirmatively. Such expression appears in A in 14:31 and 18:21 (and possibly in 11:2: ⲛⲧⲁ- could be either II perfect or relative perfect. The Greek suggests
d the latter). In BO the phenomenon is even more common (5:32; 6:68; 7:33; 8:26, 28, 46; 11:56; 12:48; 15:15; 16:18; 18:29; 19:35).

14 Attention should be called to a number of Greek oblique relatives which are translated into Coptic by the
a relative. The first of these is the construction που or οπου followed by the verb. This construction with the Greek present tense is translated by the use of a circumlocution, "the place which." Examples with the relative present occur in 3:8; 7:34, 36; 13:33, 36; 14:3, 4; 18:20.
b Three futuristic presents with οπου are translated with
c the relative future (8:21, 22; 12:26). This Greek expression may be expressed in a second way as in 8:14 where the II future is used with "where" to translate οπου
d followed by a futuristic present (ⲉⲉⲓⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲁⲧⲟ). The

---

[1] Walter C. Till, *Koptische Dialektgrammatik* (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1931), p. 38.

Greek τι is also occasionally used as a relative. The Coptic handles this expression as a non-verbal sentence with relative predicate (7:51; 15:15).

15a Three other examples deserve note. In 12:50 a Greek relative with present is used as a nominative absolute. A uses a relative substantive to translate the

b phrase (ⲛⲉⲧϫⲱ). In 9:25 εν οιδα is likewise translated acceptably with a relative substantive (ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ).[1]

c Finally, 6:64 offers an anomaly. The Greek οι πιστευουσιν is translated by a Coptic present without relative. As in 8:18 noted previously (sec. 10e), this appears to represent a de-emphasizing of the Greek expression. It should be noted here, that in 4:10 the same Coptic non-verbal structure is used to translate Greek which is virtually identical in structure with the Coptic--the attributive participle being a virtual relative here:

τις εστιν ο λεγων

ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉ [ⲉ]ⲧϫⲱ.

d Verses 4:26; 5:32; 6:33 provide similar examples.

16 Brief mention has already been made (secs. 11-12) of the place which the Coptic relative has in translating

---

[1] Thompson, p. 19, believes οιδα has dropped out, but such an assumption does not seem necessary.

the Greek participle. A fuller description shows several
a distinct patterns. First of all, the Coptic relative
present substantive is used nearly fifty times to translate
Greek participles with the article which function as nouns.
b This correspondence occurs once with relative habitude
(11:16). The remaining examples are relatives translating
the participle with article which serves adjectivally in
c the sentence. ⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧ- translates πας ο plus the
participle in the following verses: 3:15, 16, 20; 4:13;
d 11:26$^{\lambda}$; 12:46; 18:37. ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧ translating παντα τα plus
e the participle occurs in 18:4. Other examples of the
present relative used to translate an adjectival Greek
participle with article occur in 4:11, 25; 5:2 (a present
tense equivalent, the tense of habitude); 5:35$^{\lambda}$; 6:14, 50,
f 51, 57; 7:49; 8:54; 11:31$^{\lambda}$; 12:17; 14:10. Of these, only
in 4:25 and 14:10 does the Coptic relative have the article.
The second of the two may, alternatively, be regarded as
an emphatic non-verbal sentence with relative predicate.

17a There are a number of instances where the present
participle is translated by the Coptic future relative. A
future sense is implied in 4:23; 5:45; 6:27, 58; 8:12;
b 13:11. Of these, 6:27 contains a relative without article
translating adjectival participles with article; the rest

are relative substantives translating substantival parti-
c ciples. The future sense is a possible, though not
necessarily the probable interpretation in 4:24; 8:12, 50^{2};
d 12:25; 15:2^{2}; 16:2, 13; 18:2, 5. All except 15:2; 16:2;
18:2, 5 are relative substantives translating Greek substan-
tival participles. The exceptions translate adjectival
e Greek participles. Only the examples in 15:2 (first
instance) and 18:5 occur with the article accompanying the
Coptic relative.

18a An apparent variant in 4:39 demonstrates the con-
siderable understanding of the Greek which the Coptic
translator has. The adjectival present participle μαρτυ-
ρουσης is translated by an adjectival relative perfect.
The use of the present participle, however, indicates
contemporaneousness of action with that of the aorist tense
of the main verb, and the Coptic relative perfect is thus
a faithful translation of the Greek. BO misses this nuance
b by translating literally with present circumstantial. The
translation of the substantive participle ο παραδιδους in
19:11 by a relative perfect in BO (lacuna in A) appears
to reflect a variant.

19 It has been observed previously (secs. 11-12, 16-17) that the Coptic relative serves to translate Greek

a adjectival and substantive participles. The verbal
participles--variously called circumstantial by Blass and
Debrunner, adverbial by Dana and Mantey--are generally
translated by a Coptic parallel structure usually termed
circumstantial. This correspondence occurs nearly sixty
b times in A. Two examples (5:24; 14:21) where apparently
the Coptic circumstantial serves as a relative with
definite antecedent must be considered as a possible way
of writing the second relative of a series rather than as
circumstantials. The same kind of construction occurs in
BO in 11:26.

20 Verses 5:5, 6 provide two other examples of the
Greek idiom "to have age" (see sec. 4). While in the
Coptic of chapter 9 the blind man "made time," in 5:5 the
sick man "made thirty-eight years." The change from
participle to finite form in the Coptic probably represents
no variant (see sec. 38). Again in 5:6 he "made time."
As in chapter 9, these two additional examples of the
Coptic perfect translating a Greek present arise from the
difference in idiom between the two languages.

21 Four other apparent variants turn out to be
a evidence of the perceptivity of the Coptic translator. In
9:25 the present participle of ειμι appears to be

contemporaneous with a following present tense. Since,
however, the participle of ειμι does not occur normally
except in the present, the relation of the participle to
the rest of the sentence must be determined from the
context. The Coptic translator correctly interprets by
b translating with an imperfect. A similar situation obtains
between the participle ων of 3:4 and the Coptic translation
c by circumstantial perfect. The same is true of the use
of the circumstantial perfect by BO in 19:38 (lacuna in A).
d In 6:19 the present participle proves to be contemporaneous
with an aorist passive and is thus accurately rendered by
e a circumstantial perfect. The situation in 20:18 is par-
ticularly elusive. A present participle contemporaneous
with a present tense in the main verb is translated by a
Coptic perfect. This interpretation proves agreeable,
however, when it is observed that the participle is
contemporaneous with a historical present.

22 With the Coptic treatment of Greek participles
detailed, the description of the practice of A vis à vis
the Greek present is complete. The variations of BO and
F from A remain to be described. At issue here are
instances where forms of the Coptic present appear in any
of the three manuscripts. BO, first of all, has many

variations from A. Most of these, however, do not reflect
a a different Greek text. Such is the case where A translates
with II present and BO with I present (4:22; 5:34; 6:42;
7:49; 8:26, 46; 9:27; 10:20; 17:9, 1$\overset{2}{3}$; 18:23) or vice versa
b (8:15, 48, 50; 17:10). Such is also the case where A
translates with II present and BO with a non-verbal (8:53)
c or where the reverse is the case (9:28). As far as the
Greek is concerned, no difference can be discerned between
d I (A) and II (BO) habitude (8:44; 10:3, 11) or between
e I present (A) and habitude (BO) (10:18; 12:35; 16:21).
The instances where A has I present with ⲛⲛⲏⲩ and BO has
f I future with ⲓ (6:37, 45; 14:23; 16:7) or where A has ⲛⲛⲁ
with II present and BO has II future with ϣⲉ (13:3; 14:5;
16:5) are perfectly explicable, since both ⲛⲛⲁ and ⲛⲛⲏⲩ
have future sense.

23a The opposition which occurs in 6:7 (ⲙⲛ); 7:51;
14:30 where A has present and BO has future does not
involve ⲛⲛⲁ or ⲛⲛⲏⲩ (except in 14:30 where the conjunctive
in A follows ⲛⲛⲏⲩ). The difference in these cases may be
traced to Greek presents which may be interpreted as
b futuristic. This same situation explains the future (A)-
present (BO) opposition in 6:36, 56; 10:15; 16:26; 19:10.
c In the reverse opposition in 16:32 both A and BO apparently

d vary from the aorist of the Greek. A situation similar to the future-present opposition obtains in the cases (5:21; 8:35; 10:27; 15:6^{2}) where A has I future and BO has the
e tense of habitude. No variant is indicated in the identical correspondence in 10:5 where the TR uses the future φευξονται
f to describe what may be interpreted as customary. Even the aorist passive εξηρανθη of 15:6 could be interpreted either as future (conjunctive after future) as in A, or as
g customary as in BO.[1] A and BO agree in using the I future
h for the other futuristic aorist in 15:6. In the case of the present subjunctive in 5:19, the habitude of BO, which expresses what the Father may be expected to do, is acceptable; but the future of A is probably more appropriate to the Greek.

24 In a couple of instances the future-present opposition seems difficult to reconcile, and so one or the other may be regarded as deriving from a variant Greek text. The context of 14:7 hardly allows the future used by BO. Again, in 16:16 the conjunctive following a non-verbal in A seems to vary from the future οψεσθε. However,

---

[1] Cf. Blass and Debrunner, p. 171.

this may be a case where the conjunctive is used independently with future meaning.[1]

25 In 6:33 a very minor question arises. The two participles are translated in A by a present relative substantive followed by a conjunctive. BO translates with a present relative substantive followed by an apparent I present (ϥϯ). A conjunctive sense is surely implied in BO. ⲟⲩⲟϩⲉ precedes ϥϯ. Here the ⲛ may have been suppressed.[2]

26 There are a number of instances where the question
of variation is clouded with uncertainty. One puzzling
opposition which occurs between BO and A is the use by one
a of the present where the other has imperfect. The im-
perfect of A in 11:9 has already been designated (sec. 8b)
a scribal error. If this explanation be accepted, a
b different Greek text is not reflected in this case. Verse
11:42 seems to be a different matter. The ηδειν of the
TR is awkward and while BO follows the Greek literally
(the pluperfect of οιδα being used as an imperfect in New
c Testament Greek), A varies to a smoother present. An

---

[1] Cf. Till, Koptische Grammatik, p. 165.

[2] See Mallon, p. 119.

apparent imperfect in 7:41 of BO against a Greek present and a II present in A is actually a combination of two readings. In the first, ⲙⲙⲏ serves as interrogative. In the second, the question is reversed from "Does the Christ come from Galilee?" to "Does not the Christ come from Galilee?" The editor brackets ⲁⲛ but fails to bracket the preceding ⲛ which in combination with the following II
d present gives the appearance of an imperfect. In 5:18; 9:16; 10:21 where the Greek and BO have imperfect, A has II present (a similar situation prevails in 7:40 where BO has ⲡⲉϫⲁ⸗). If the scribe of A wished to emphasize both adverbial extension and the durative action of the Greek imperfect, the II present might be the nearest equivalent. The II perfect would emphasize the adverbial phrase but would indicate limitative action. The Coptic imperfect, on the other hand, would not stress the adverbial extension. A II imperfect (ⲉⲛⲉ-) would be easily confused with a
e circumstantial conditional imperfect.[1] Verse 17:12 provides

---

[1] Whether such a form exists is a question. H. J. Polotsky, in Orientalia, XXIX (1960), 400 f., raises the question and suggests one likely example (Acts 22:24). A possible example occurs in A in 18:30. A few isolated "possibilities" do not severely threaten the argument presented in sec. 27.

an example where A and BO agree in the use of this construction to translate a Greek imperfect.

27a Verse 18:20 presents a different problem. Here the aorist εδιδαξα is translated with II present by A, imperfect by BO. On the grounds presented in the previous section, the II present of A is probably equivalent to the imperfect of BO. If this equivalency is accepted, one is faced with Coptic imperfects opposite a Greek aorist. διδασκω is in some respects a verb of "saying." With regard to verbs of saying there is considerable ambiguity in the tense-use of the Greek. The aorist is generally used for reference to an utterance previously made, while the imperfect serves to delineate the content of a speech.[1] The fact is, however, that, as one researcher on the subject indicates,[2] it is often impossible to decide why a writer has chosen one of the tenses in preference to the other. In addition to this interchange of Greek usage, Coptic in using ⲡⲉϫⲉ″ for both ειπον and ελεγον exhibits the same ambiguity (see below, sec. 149). In view of this

---

[1] Blass and Debrunner, p. 170.

[2] Arvid Svensson, Zum Gebrauch der erzählenden Tempora im Grieschischen (Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Buchdrucherei, 1930), p. 51.

practice in Greek and Coptic, it is perhaps possible to
see how εδιδαξα could be translated in Coptic by the
b imperfect. One may similarly account for the use of the
perfect in BO at 7:14 (lacuna in A) to translate εδιδασκε.

28a Two other oppositions should be noted. The im-
perfect (A)-habitude (BO) opposition in 12:11 appears to
b be a variant in BO. On the other hand, the imperfect
non-verbal of BO in 18:14 does not vary from the non-verbal
of A which is rendered past by context.

29 In two cases where a subjunctive with εαν is
translated, a conditional in A appears to be a II present
a in BO (5:43; 6:51). These may be "virtual" conditional
constructions indicated by context rather than tense
prefix and similar to imperfect conditional clauses which
occur in A without the initial circumstantial ⲉ- (11:21,
b 32; 14:28). On the other hand, if Kasser is correct,[1]
these may be anomalous positive conditional forms which
omit -ϣⲁⲛ-. If this should be the case, then in BO a
conditional instead of a II present would be a satisfactory
parallel to the I future with ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ (A) as a translation of
a Greek present subjunctive in 12:26.

---

[1] Rodolphe Kasser, "A propos des différentes formes du conditionnel coptes," Le Muséon, LXXVI (1963), 269.

30 A "virtual" conditional probably occurs in 10:12 of A. The conditional of BO is paralleled by a series of habitudes in A which taken together can only yield conditional sense. In the Greek, the conditional sense is not explicit but rather possesses the same virtual character which appears in A.

31a An example where the future (conjunctive after
I future) of A is paralleled apparently by circumstantial
in BO (16:22) intrinsically requires a future sense, so
that the example in BO must probably be regarded as a
b III future which has lost the final -ϵ-.[1] The apparent
II present of 16:25 in BO would then also be a III future
c corresponding to the II future of A. The II present of BO
in 19:24 has future sense by context. It is part of an
idiomatic variation which arises from the oblique Greek
τινος εσται. The futurity carries over from the optative
which is followed apparently by a conjunctive lacking the
initial ⲛ. The text of A is too fragmentary at this point
to be of much help.

---

[1] Although Kasser, in Le Muséon, LXXVI (1963), 268, admits such a loss occurs frequently in the common speech, he prefers to relate the form to his theory that the circumstantial, conditional, and III future have arisen from the same primitive structure.

32 The meaning of the last phrase in 8:25 has puzzled more than one translator. A translates ⲗⲁⲗⲱ literally with the I present. If, however, ⲗⲁⲗⲱ is to be taken as a perfective present,[1] the perfect of BO (with the wording altered to ⲁⲓⲉⲣⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲥⲁϫⲓ) is an appropriate translation.

33 The II perfect (A)-II present (BO) opposition in 13:29 is readily explained by the fact that the underlying Greek is a historical present. A translates the sense of the Greek; BO, the letter.

34 The noteworthy example ποιειτε in 8:38 can be either present tense or present imperative. A interprets as imperative; BO, as present.

35 The appropriateness of the Coptic perfect as a translation of the Greek perfect is noted below (sec. 156a). Thus, BO in 17:10 may be considered a literal translation of δεδοξασμαι. Since the Coptic expression ϫⲓⲉⲁⲩ (A) is intrinsically passive, and the Greek perfect passive is virtually identical in meaning with the present passive, the use of present tense by A is also suitable. From the form, BO could be considered a II present as readily as I perfect.

---

[1] See Blass and Debrunner, p. 168.

36 Finally, among the finite verb forms there are a
number of examples where one or the other of the two manu-
a scripts probably varies from the Greek. In 6:26 BO twice
employs what must be regarded as an anomalous form of the
perfect (ⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛ-) to translate a Greek aorist.[1] The intro-
duction in A of the II future with a purpose clause appears
b to be a variant. In 6:36 BO again uses the anomalous
perfect form for second-person plural to translate a Greek
perfect. The future used by A must be regarded as a
c variant. In 14:24 and 15:15 BO varies in translating a
Greek present by a perfect. In these instances, the scribe
has apparently confused the negative perfect (ⲙⲡⲉ-) with
the negative habitude (ⲙⲡⲁ-), although in 14:24 the perfect
d may simply reflect a variant. The tense of habitude
employed by A in 7:42 does not agree with the perfect of
BO and the aorist of TR, but the disagreement may not
e reflect a variant (see sec. 64 below). There is, likewise,
no agreement between the II present of A in 11:13 and the
pluperfect of the Greek (translated by imperfect perfect
in BO).

---

[1] Except in the second-person plural the tense forms of the Bohairic II present and I perfect are identical. In this sentence the same form for the second-person plural appears both for the II present and I perfect.

37 With the variations apparent and actual between
the finite tense forms of A and BO described, the variations involving circumstantials and relatives must be
dealt with. The correspondences between similar finite
Coptic tenses which can equally translate the Greek present
a carry over into the circumstantial and relative. Thus,
the circumstantial habitude (A) and the circumstantial
present represent an identity as far as Greek is concerned
b (5:2; 9:11). Likewise, the conditional used by BO in 14:15
is just another way of saying the same thing which A says
c with ⲉϣⲡⲉ followed by circumstantial. The numerous occurrences (6:26; 7:28, 52; 8:39, 48; 9:28, 30, 34; 12:30;
17:1) seem ample evidence that the circumstantial ⲉϥϫⲱ (A)
d can be regarded as equivalent to the BO ⲡⲉϫⲁ″. Likewise
in 16:16 the idiomatic expression ⲧⲉⲧⲛ[ⲗⲟ] ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲛⲉⲩ in A
and the I future of BO are both acceptable renderings of
a negative futuristic present in the Greek.

38 There are several examples where A and BO differ
in that one has an imperfect; the other, a circumstantial.
a In 11:38 BO translates literally the Greek participle with
circumstantial; in 20:15 A has the literal circumstantial.
The opposing imperfect in each case does not differ, so
far as tense is concerned, from the Greek present participle

which in each case is contemporaneous with a historical
present. Whether or not the switch from participle to
finite form represents a variant is another question.
b Greek, at least, sometimes uses a participle in place of a
finite verb,[1] and there are probably sufficient examples
c to infer a similar practice in Coptic.[2] Other examples
occur in 18:4, 10 where A translates literally, and yet
the imperfect in BO probably does not represent a variant
from the present participle contemporary with a main verb
d in the aorist. The situation is reversed in 12:6, 13;
18:40; 19:3 where the Greek imperfect in the first three
examples is translated literally by A. In the fourth
example BO has the imperfect. In each case, however, the
opposing circumstantial is rendered past by the context.
e Instances where A and BO agree in using the circumstantial
f for the imperfect occur in 11:38; 18:18. In one instance
(11:51) a present participle contemporary with an aorist
is translated by an imperfect in BO and in A by a non-verbal which is past by context.

---

[1] See Blass and Debrunner, p. 245.

[2] There are numerous situations where a Greek aorist participle is translated by a Coptic perfect (5:6; 6:5, 11, 17, 22, 25, 45; 9:11; 11:32, 45; 12:36; 13:1, 4, 25, 26; 18:3, 4; 19:2, 29; 20:5, 16).

39 In 20:19 the present circumstantial of A is a satisfactory rendering of the Greek perfect passive participle joined to a main verb in the aorist tense. The imperfect of BO, however, seems to indicate a continuous aspect of action which is absent in the Greek.

40a A substitution of finite tenses for participles occurs in 6:5. Both BO and A translate two initial aorist participles with finite perfects. Then ερχεται, a historic present, is translated by A with I present; by
b BO, with a circumstantial. A similar situation occurs in 12:15 where the present of A literally agrees with the Greek, but BO has circumstantial.

41 Perhaps the case for a Coptic use of dependent verbals (circumstantial) in the place of finite forms forms comparable to the Greek use described above (sec. 38b), of participials for finite verbs, is best argued on the basis of four occurrences in BO. In Bohairic there is no confusion between circumstantials and II
a presents. Thus, in both 6:6 and 12:6 circumstantials clearly stand in positions in which they can be translated only as independent clauses. In section 37c a correspondence between ⲉϥϫⲱ and ⲡⲉϫⲁ" was observed. Since the word ⲉϥϫⲱ is at issue in both 6:6 and 12:6 (first instance)

perhaps such a correspondence explains the usage although the examples of section 37c involve the stereotyped phrase, "He answered and said" / "He answered, saying." However, such an explanation would not fit 9:31 where a circumstantial habitude in BO stands opposite the finite tense

b in Greek (present) and in A (habitude). In 6:6 where Greek has imperfect, the context of BO is clearly past time. The context of the instance in 12:6 is also past time. Probably both examples are equivalent to the Greek imperfect. The fact that the example in 12:6 translates a Greek aorist rather than an imperfect and that both examples are translated in A by II perfect can probably be traced to the ambiguity of tense which exists in both Greek and Coptic with regard to verbs of "saying" (see sec. 27).

42a In 9:7 the circumstantial of BO is a literal translation of the Greek present participle. Since, however, the Greek participle is contemporaneous with an aorist, the perfect used by A does not represent a variant. The use here in A of a finite tense in place of a participle is another instance of this reversal which may be added to

b those cited above (secs. 38 ff.). A reversal in the opposite direction occurs in 12:21 where a Greek imperfect is translated in BO by a circumstantial rendered past by context. The perfect used by A is perhaps understandable on the basis of the uncertainty which exists in the Greek about the quality of action (complete or incomplete) in such words as ερωταω.[1]

43 Several miscellaneous oppositions do not appear
a to reflect a variant Greek text. In 9:41 A translates ει followed by imperfect literally with a circumstantial imperfect. The state of blindness described in the Greek would not ordinarily be appropriately translated by a circumstantial habitude, which would imply repeated action. The translation of BO, however, using circumstantial habitude (assuming ϫⲉ ⲉϣⲁⲣⲉ- from ϫⲉϣⲁⲣⲉ-) in conjunction with the qualitative of ⲉⲓⲣⲉ seems to be close to the TR.
b Secondly, in 16:21 of A the present circumstantial followed by the future circumstantial is paralleled in BO by a conditional followed by a present circumstantial.[2] Since the two constructions give the same general sense, one may probably assume that both reflect the subjunctive of
c the TR. In another opposition (18:1) a present

---

[1] Blass and Debrunner, pp. 169 f.

[2] Cf. Till, Koptische Grammatik, p. 172, for the consecutive use of the circumstantial present and circumstantial future in Sahidic to express the imminent future.

circumstantial, past by context in A, is equivalent to the
d more explicit circumstantial imperfect of BO. The Greek
of 13:5 uses two infinitives to describe Jesus' washing
and wiping of the disciples' feet. While A translates
literally with two infinitives, BO follows the first
infinitive with a circumstantial. In view of the possibility
of translating the Greek infinitives with gerunds
instead of with the preposition "to," one might possibly
translate both the infinitive and circumstantial in BO
with "-ing" forms.

44 Finally, there are three cases of opposition
a between circumstantial and circumstantial perfect. In
11:28 BO translates literally the aorist participle with
circumstantial perfect. As Blass and Debrunner (p. 217)
note, however, the aorist participle does not give time
sequence here but is used in preference to the present
participle because it is the first reference in the
sentence to the fact of speech following the initial verb
εφωνησεν. The circumstantial present of A is thus equally
b suitable. In 19:38 the present participle is contemporaneous
with a main verb in the aorist. Thus, A translates
the participle literally with circumstantial present, and
BO from the context translates with circumstantial perfect.

c On the other hand, in 18:18 the circumstantial of BO
appears to vary from the perfect participle of Greek and
the circumstantial perfect of A.

45 The remaining differences between A and BO involve
the utilization of the relative. Numerous situations
involve the use, already described, of tenses which differ
in Coptic but cannot be distinguished from each other in
a Greek. Thus, the use by A of relative habitude where BO
has relative present (9:7; 20:16) or vice versa (5:21;
b 18:20) involves no Greek variant. The same is true when
A uses relative substantive habitude; BO, relative present
c substantive (11:16; 20:24). In view of the futuristic
sense of ⲛⲛⲏⲩ and ⲛⲛⲁ no tense variant is involved between
A and BO in the cases where A has the relative present
of ⲛⲛⲏⲩ and BO has the relative future of ⲓ (11:27), or
where A has the relative present of ⲛⲛⲁ and BO has the
d relative future of ϣⲉ (13:36; 14:4) or ϣⲱⲡⲓ (18:4). In
16:13 the situation is reversed with A having relative
future with ϣⲱⲡⲉ and BO having relative present with ⲛⲏⲟⲩ.
The Greek presents and present participles in all these
cases can be interpreted futuristically.

46 The phrase ετι μικρον χρονον μεθ υμων ειμι occurs
in 7:33. This passage is almost identical with the one

discussed previously (sec. 7) in 12:35. In using the relative BO is very near the circumstantial used by A in 12:35. The future (relative) used by BO is easily explicable from the Greek; A is mutilated at this point.

47 Still other expressions differing in A and BO which do not represent variation from the Greek hinge on the matter of differing degrees of emphasis. Attention has already been called (sec. 10d) to the use of emphatic non-verbal sentences with relative predicates. There are numerous disagreements at this point between A and BO. In
a 19:35 the present of A contrasts with an emphatic non-
b verbal with relative predicate in BO. In 6:61; 9:30; 13:18; 18:21 the emphatic construction is used by A, while BO
c with the TR uses the simple present. This same kind of variation occurs in 9:17; 16:18; 18:34 where A has II
d present and BO has the emphatic construction; and in 8:13 where, on the contrary, BO has the II present, and A has
e the non-verbal construction. In 9:21, 23 imperatives translated literally in A (first instance omitted) appear as non-verbals with relative predicates in which the object αυτον becomes the subject of the Coptic sentence.

48 There are several instances where A has relative present or relative present substantive and BO has relative

a future or relative future substantive. In 4:36; 5:24;
6:54, 56; 12:46 this opposition uses relative substantives
to translate Greek substantival present participles which
serve as the subject of the sentence. Since future sense
is possible in all these cases, no variant is evident.
b The futuristic implication of the Greek accounts for the
difference between the Coptic texts in two instances in
6:40 where a participle used as an adjective is translated.
c A similar Greek nuance accounts for the reverse relative
d future (A)-relative present (BO) opposition in 6:27. In
15:7 the subjunctive in a relative clause used as object
of the sentence accounts for the difference in tense
e (A present, BO future) of the relative substantives. In
14:4 the relative present of ⲛⲛⲁ is futuristic in tone and
with the relative future of BO is an appropriate rendering
f of a Greek futuristic present used with οπου. In like
manner, the futuristic present with οπου in 13:33 is
translated satisfactorily by a relative with non-verbal in
A, by the relative future in BO. The relative future of
BO in 6:32 is the predicate of a non-verbal sentence
translating a futuristic finite present.

49 There are a considerable number of relative
imperfects in BO paralleling various Greek relative

a structures: (1) with οπου (6:62; 7:42 [circumstantial
relative in A]; 10:40; 11:32; 12:1; 18:1 [circumstantial
b relative]; 20:19), (2) the participle used as adjective
c (6:22; 11:31), (3) the participle as substantive (9:8),
d (4) the relative as adjective (11:2; 17:5; 18:16; 19:26).
The examples in first and fourth groups are paralleled by
the imperfect tense in the Greek. The Greek participles
of the second and third groups may be judged imperfect
through context. Since A never makes use of the imperfect
relative (except in 9:13, 24), the tense of the relative
must be determined by context. On this basis all these
cases may be judged imperfect in A.

50 Not all the relative present-relative imperfect
a oppositions are so readily brought into accord. In 11:52
the present relative of A taken as a passive is roughly
equivalent to the perfect passive participle of the TR.
In view of the usual translation of the Greek perfect by
Coptic perfect or present, however, it is difficult to
see a relative imperfect (BO) as a legitimate translation
b of such a participle. In 20:19 a lacuna makes the reading
of A uncertain. BO uses imperfect opposite a Greek
circumstantial present participle past by context. If the
switch between finite and dependent tense forms observed

elsewhere (secs. 38 ff.) be allowed, no real variant exists here.

51 The situation in 16:17 is somewhat unusual. The speech is in the form of direct address but narrates the fact that Jesus had said something previously. The relative present of A agrees with the λεγει of the text. With the use of the relative perfect, however, BO apparently interprets the verb as what Greek grammarians term a perfective present.[1]

52 One other opposition may be noted here. In 6:13 BO translates the Greek perfect participle with relative perfect, but A uses relative present. The context in A clearly requires a past sense for this relative.

53 Briefly, there are two variations between A and BO

a which are slight but deserve mention. In 14:31 the typical expression "this is the way" followed by relative is produced in typical form in A, but appears in BO as "this is the way" followed by I present. This usage appears to be a scribal inconsistency independent of any Greek basis.

b Secondly, while BO translates 6:64 literally, A omits the relative οι. This omission, too, appears to be a result of scribal inconsistency, since A must be supplied with a relative in translation in order to give good sense.

---

[1] See Blass and Debrunner, p. 168.

54 There are, finally, a number of differences between A and BO which are apparently variants in one or the other of the texts. All involve an opposition of usage between
a present and perfect. In 6:50 the relative present of A is equivalent to the present participle of the Greek, but
b the relative perfect of BO appears to be a variant. The same is true of the perfect of BO in 7:39 where A apparently
c (brief lacuna) agrees with the TR. In 6:63 the reverse is true. It is the relative perfect of A which varies from
d the Greek relative with present. The situation is reversed again in 5:29; 12:48 where the relative present of BO
e varies from the relative with aorist in the Greek. In 6:63 ⲙⲡⲉⲥ in BO may have been intended to represent not the negative perfect but rather the negative habitude ⲙⲡⲁⲥ,
f which would parallel the I present of A. However, while the present of A agrees with the Greek in 5:38, 41; 8:15; 16:9, the perfect of BO is an inappropriate translation and therefore suggests textual variation in the underlying
g Greek. On the other hand, the perfect of BO agrees with Greek aorist in 12:28, but the present of A does not.
h Likewise, the present of BO agrees with the Greek in 5:43,

i 8:43; 16:7, 30, but the perfect of A does not. The perfect of A does, however, agree with the aorist of the Greek in 17:25, while the present of BO does not.

55 When one turns to the variations of F from A, one may note immediately several situations (where F agrees with BO) which have already been dealt with. Fitting this category are the II present (A)-imperfect oppositions (F) of 7:40 and 10:21 (sec. 26d); the use in 10:24 of ⲡⲉϫⲉϥ (A) opposite ⲉϥϫⲱ (F) (sec. 37c); the relative present (A)-relative perfect (F) opposition in 6:13 (sec. 52); and the circumstantial (A)-imperfect opposition (F) of 11:38 (sec. 38). On the basis of this last situation the reverse imperfect (A)-circumstantial (F) opposition of 11:56 is understandable. In this case the circumstantial is past by context.

56 Aside from the differences accounted for above, three others are explained on the basis of patterns already
a established: the II present (A)-I present (F) oppositions (6:42; 9:27; 10:20; also 8:41 where A has the I present)
b (sec. 1b); the I habitude (A)-II habitude (F) conflict
c (10:3) (sec. 22c); the II present (A)-II future (F) contrast
d in 10:1; and the negative habitude (A)-negative III future opposition of 10:5. The Greek in both of the last two

references serves as the medium for maxim-like statements of Jesus where either a customary or future sense is e possible (sec. 2a). In 10:1 the Greek is a substantive present participle which the Coptic of both texts translates f with a finite form. An aorist subjunctive (ακολουθησωσιν) appears in the Greek of 10:5,[1] but it is used to describe what may be expected in terms of what is customarily the case.

57 Three other situations are explicable on the basis a of constructions described previously. The non-verbal with relative predicate used by A in 9:30 is simply an emphatic form (sec. 10d) opposite the simple present of F b (and BO and the Greek). Similarly, the non-verbal with relative predicate used by A in 6:61 indicates greater emphasis than the present used by F (and BO and the Greek). c In 13:33 F uses the emphatic construction opposite the finite tense in A.

58 The three remaining oppositions are not easily a resolved. In 6:13 the perfect of A seems to be paralleled

---

[1] Although ακολουθησωσιν appears in form to be an aorist subjunctive, it may simply represent a variant spelling of the future witnessed by the best manuscripts. The future fits the context much better.

in F by II present. If the editor of F is correct, there
should be no confusion between perfect and II present,
since the perfect always occurs with the prefix ϩⲁ-.[1] The
II present, however, does not fit the context in F. The
verb in question is preceded and followed by perfects with
the ϩⲁ- prefix. If, as Husselman believes, F is not an
independent translation from the Greek, but is based on
the Sahidic and Bohairic texts,[2] both of which generally
have the perfect prefix ⲁ-, it is possible that the perfect
with the ⲁ- prefix occurs here as an inconsistency of the
b scribe based on a mixing of dialect usages. The same
inconsistency may occur in 6:71, but in this case the matter
is less easy to decide. Here the imperfect of A, BO, and
the Greek is rendered with the form ⲁϥϫⲱ. Taken as a
perfect, the form would correspond to the other texts in
time sequence, but would differ in Aktionsart.[3] On the
other hand, the use of the II present for the imperfect is
a phenomenon already noted in A (sec. 26d). It is likely
that here in F the same concern for adverbial extension

---

[1] Husselman, p. 11.

[2] Ibid., p. 18.

[3] It should be noted that in the view of Ropes, p. 321, the Greek imperfect is often rendered in Sahidic, at least, by the Coptic preterit (perfect).

cited with regard to A is operative. No variant seems to be indicated.

59 The Greek at issue in 10:6 reads τινα ην α ελαλει αυτοις. ελαλει is translated in A by II present; in F, by the relative present predicate of a non-verbal sentence. The translation of F, made past by context, seems a clear representation of the Greek. In fact, the Greek is closely parallel in structure to the Coptic. Both the Greek and F make the initial part of the sentence emphatic by the use of this particular structure. Although the tense of A may be regarded as equivalent to the Greek on the grounds presented in section 26d, the difference in construction may derive from a different Greek text. BO in this case translates α ελαλει by a relative present which is apparently past by context.

Greek Aorist Tense

60a Turning to the Greek aorist tense, one finds that in A the perfect (or negative perfect) is used to translate the aorist in an overwhelming majority of the cases. This

b correspondence occurs over 350 times. The II perfect, equivalent to the I perfect as far as Greek is concerned,

c is used over twenty-five times. The past temporal is used
twenty times to translate a Greek aorist when used following
ως or οτε. In all of these cases the Coptic is clearly
appropriate and "literal."

61 There are a number of other types of situations
which, although less obvious, seem likewise to fit the
a category of "literal" translations. The Greek aorist with
αν is translated appropriately by Coptic imperfect future
b (11:32; 14:2, 28; 18:30). The example in 18:30 is somewhat
puzzling. It has the appearance of a circumstantial
imperfect future, but it does not function as a dependent
member of the sentence. It may be that, contrary to the
suggestion made previously (sec. 26d), a II imperfect
future is a possible usage. The phrase "give into your
hands" admits of adverbial extension. As a II imperfect
future it would then be entirely equivalent, as far as
the Greek is concerned, to the imperfect future of BO.
On the other hand, a more remote possibility is that the
c ⲉ stands for the negative ⲛ.[1] One additional case of the
aorist with αν (4:10) is translated in A by the simple

---

[1] Cf. Kahle, I, 115.

imperfect. Here the ⲛⲁ of the imperfect future has probably been omitted through error.

62a Like the aorist-with-αν construction the use of ει with the aorist attracts a clearly appropriate translation. In these cases (15:22, 24) the circumstantial imperfect
b perfect is used. Somewhat puzzling, however, is the use of the imperfect perfect to translate a regular aorist in 5:13. The problem is eliminated, however, when one recognizes that this aorist fits the category described by Dana and Mantey (p. 196) as "culminative." It denotes the conclusion of a process. Such an aorist is best translated into English, depending on the context, by a perfect or pluperfect. The pluperfect context in this case is quite appropriately handled in A by an imperfect perfect.

63a The use of ϣⲁⲛⲧ- ("until") is an appropriate
b translation of εως οτου with the aorist in 9:18. In 16:24 a similar phrase (εως αρτι with aorist) used negatively is translated with ⲙⲡⲁⲧ- ("not yet"), a negative parallel of ϣⲁⲛⲧ-.

64 The use in 7:42 of the tense of habitude to translate the aorist in the phrase ουχι η γραφη ειπεν is questionable. The tense of habitude seems singularly

inappropriate. The use of the aorist here is unusual and perhaps puzzled the translator. It would appear that he regarded it as what Blass and Debrunner (p. 171) call a gnomic aorist. Such an aorist may express an act which is valid for all time.[1] A gnomic aorist may also express what is customarily the case or what may be expected. Perhaps with this latter sense in mind, the translator felt the tense of habitude was the best equivalent for ειπεν.

65 The Greek aorist translated by the Coptic imperfect presents some problems. Ropes recognizes the difficulty of distinguishing variants between these two tenses of Greek and Coptic but surmises that a Coptic imperfect in narrative almost certainly represents a Greek imperfect.[2] The situation does not seem so clear-cut to the present investigator. The Coptic imperfect only rarely translates a Greek aorist. It normally renders the Greek imperfect. Exceptions to this practice seem to cluster around certain categories of words. One such category involves words of "saying" (see sec. 27). The word κραζω falls into this

---

[1] Blass and Debrunner, p. 171.

[2] Ropes, p. 321.

category. Thus, the use of imperfect by A (perfect in BO) in 7:37 to translate the aorist of κραζω cannot reliably be charged to a different Greek text.

66a In other cases the question of variation must
perhaps remain open. The aorist of 9:18 ("believe") is a
possible variant, but the nature of the word "believe" is
such that ambivalence concerning the kind of action it
b expresses (aorist or imperfect) is understandable. This
uncertainty prevails in the reverse imperfect (TR)-perfect
c opposition in 12:47. The same may be said of the use of
"witness" in 12:17 where the reverse imperfect (TR)-perfect
(A) opposition occurs. In this instance the opposition
might be reconciled by considering this word a word of
"saying" (sec. 27).

67 Two instances where the II future translates the aorist (6:26; 17:12) seem to be clear variants. These cases along with the examples where a future meaning has been preferred over the more obvious customary sense may represent a specific eschatological tendency on the part of the translator of A. In 6:26, however, the translator may have failed to see the causative force of οτι and simply have erred in translating οτι and what follows as a result clause.

68 There are several cases where the aorist is translated by the II present. There would appear to be no alternative to considering such instances variants. In fact, Thompson (p. 58) refers to one of them (8:12) as a scribal error. There is one other possibility. As noted previously (sec. 27) with regard to the New Testament Greek, where verbs of "saying" are concerned, the reason for the choice of the aorist is often completely obscure. Attention has been called (sec. 26d), also, to a possible necessary correspondence between the Coptic II present and the Greek imperfect. With these two factors in mind along with the fact that the examples in question all involve, at least indirectly, verbs of saying (8:12, λαλεω; 11:51, προφητευω; 18:20, διδασκω), it is possible to imagine that these II presents of A derive from the aorists of the Greek. The ambiguities of the situation are further demonstrated by the fact that BO translates the first two cases with the perfect and the last one with the imperfect.

69 A different situation is involved in 16:27 where the aorist εξηλθον is opposed by the II present ⲉⲉⲓⲛⲛⲏⲩ. One thinks of the verb παρειμι which can mean either "to be present" or "to have come," but there is no lexical evidence that ⲛⲛⲏⲩ ever translates παρειμι. It may be

that the translator interpreted the aorist in the sense that modern grammarians would call "culminative."[1] Such an interpretation, similar to the Greek perfect, would emphasize the reality of a present fact resultant on a past action. From such an interpretation, the Coptic present might result. The I perfect used by BO in this instance is the usual translation of the aorist.

70 Three cases seem without question to reflect variants: the aorist-I present opposition in 7:31; 12:28; and the aorist-future opposition in 2:17.

71 In general, the use of the Coptic relative perfect
follows the patterns already described in treating the
a relative present. On the pattern of the use with the
present tense, καθως and the aorist is translated in A
by the phrase "according to the way which" followed by the
relative perfect (6:57, 58; 8:28; 14:31; 15:9, 12; 17:2,
b 18, 21; 20:21). Similarly, the aorists with ουτω (3:16)
and ουτως (5:26) are translated respectively by the
phrases "this is the way which" and "in the way which"
c followed by the relative perfect. The relative perfect
also appears in emphatic non-verbal sentences with relative

---

[1] See Dana and Mantey, pp. 196 f.

perfect predicates (5:11, 36; 6:22, 70; 8:42; 9:2, 11, 21; 11:42; 12:38, 49; 15:16^{2}; 17:8, 25; 18:26, 34, 35; 19:21; 20:15). In all of the foregoing instances the subject of the Coptic non-verbal sentence is equivalent to the subject of the Greek sentence, and so no change of subject occurs
d in the relative predicate. In four examples, however, the subject of the Coptic non-verbal translates the object of the Greek sentence (6:27; 9:26; 12:16; 18:35 [second instance]), and the subject of the Greek sentence becomes the subject of the relative form which is the predicate of the non-verbal sentence.

72 One other construction may be mentioned here. In τουτο παλιν δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν (4:54), there is no article with the noun, so the adjective may be taken attributively or predicatively. Taken predicatively a relative is then implied. The Coptic in using a relative has apparently interpreted the phrase in the predicative sense.

73 In translating the Greek relative with aorist the relative perfect exhibits little variation from the
a patterns of the relative present. On the analogy of the usage with the present tense there occurs the relative perfect translating the adjectival relative modifying πας

b (4:29, 39, 45; 10:8, 41). The relative perfect is used
to translate various other adjectival relative expressions
(2:22; 4:29 [circumstantial relative], 50; 5:36; 6:13, 14;
7:36; 8:40 [circumstantial relative]; 15:20; 17:12, 26;
18:9, 32). The foregoing examples all occur in Coptic
c without the article. Two examples cited previously
(sec. 12c) adopt the Greek attributive pattern ο ανϑρωπος
ο αγαϑος and serve as adjectives with article (12:9, 38).
d The parallel pattern with the demonstrative in place of
the article occurs in 4:12; 8:53; and 10:35. The relative
perfect with the article is also used to translate a
number of Greek adjectival relatives which in the Greek,
to use a contradiction of terms, precede their antecedents
(5:38; 8:26; 18:9).

74 One adjectival relative in the Greek, on account of Coptic idiom, appears as a nominal relative. In 15:15 the Greek πας plus adjectival relative is translated by a relative substantive followed probably (a lacuna here) by ⲧⲏⲣ.

75 The relative perfect substantive is used opposite
Greek relatives which serve in various substantive ways:
ab as nominative absolute (10:36), as the object of a verb
c (11:45, 46; 13:18; 17:3; 18:21), and as the object of a

d preposition (4:52, 53; 6:29; 10:35; 18:1). A final example (18:26), having a relative in the genitive case, serves implicitly as the object of a preposition.

76a As was the case with the Greek present tense, so also where the aorist is used with the oblique relative οπου, A uses the phrase "the place which" with the relative
b perfect (4:46; 6:23; 11:30; 19:18, 20). Likewise, as with the present, a second Coptic idiom may be used to render
c this Greek expression. In 20:13 the Greek που εθηκαν appears in the Coptic with a II perfect ([N]ⲧⲁⲩⲕⲁⲁϥ ⲧⲟ).

77a Several miscellaneous oppositions between the Greek and A remain. First, in 9:14 the translation of οτε τον πηλον εποιησεν ο ιησους by a relative perfect is appropriate, since οτε is often used in Greek as a substitute for a relative pronoun after an expression denoting
b time.[1] The translation of an aorist preceded by οτε in 19:23 with a relative perfect in A appears to be a variant since no expression denoting time precedes οτε. BO agrees with the TR. Again, on the same pattern described for the

---

[1] Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, translated and adapted from the 4th revised and augmented edition by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 592.

present tense (sec. 14d), in 18:21 τι used as a relative
with aorist appears in A as a non-verbal with relative
c perfect predicate. Finally, the relative future of 14:26
translating a Greek relative with aorist appears to be a
variant.

78 The pattern already observed of the Coptic
relative serving for the Greek participle holds true with
the aorist participle. The relative perfect substantive
serves to translate aorist participles with article used
ab in various substantive ways: in a comparison (13:16), as
c subject of the sentence (5:11, 13), as object of a verbal
d element (5:24) or the verb (15:21), as object of a preposition
e (3:13; 12:44; 16:5), with the genitive case (4:34;
5:30; 6:38, 39; 9:4, 18; 13:28).

79 In four instances non-verbal sentences with relative predicates (5:15; 11:2) or relative substantive subjects (7:28; 8:26) are paralleled by almost identical structure in the Greek.

80 Several other patterns emerge where the Coptic
relative perfect translates Greek aorist participles used
a as adjectives. In some instances, the Greek adjectival
participle with article is translated by a Coptic relative
which lacks the article (5:23; 6:41, 44, 45, 51, 58;

b 11:37; 19:32). In other cases, the Greek adjectival aorist
participle with article is, on the order of the Greek ο
ανθρωπος ο αγαθος, paralleled by a Coptic relative perfect
c with article (5:29; 7:50; 12:12).[1] The substitution of
the demonstrative for the Coptic article occurs in 18:14.
d The second Greek attributive form, ο αγαθος ανθρωπος, is
paralleled by the use of the Coptic relative perfect,
without article, following the noun it modifies (6:12;
8:16; 11:33; 12:49; 14:24).

81 A number of Coptic usages involving the circum-
a stantial need explanation. First, the circumstantial
perfect in 6:23 is the expected translation of an aorist
participle used verbally. The relative perfect used by
BO is not the usual translation for a verbal participle
b but probably does not represent a variant. The use of the
present relative in 12:29 for the aorist participle is not
on first view so suitable, but on closer examination,
although the main verb has been lost in a lacuna, the
relative may probably be seen as past time by context.
c The relative futures used to translate aorist participles

---

[1] In 12:12, alternatively, one could translate the beginning of the verse as a non-verbal sentence with relative predicate.

in 5:25 and 13:26 likewise require explanation. In both of these cases the time of the aorist participle is anterior to the time of the following finite future. This anterior time of the aorist participle is, however, relative to the time of the speaker, in the future. Consequently it might suitably be translated by an English future perfect. An acceptable translation of the Greek in 5:25, for example, might be "A time is coming . . . when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who shall have heard will live."

82 In two instances an aorist participle is translated
a by a Coptic conditional. In 12:24 the Coptic does what Greek sometimes does: it substitutes a paratactic expression for the Greek conditional subjunctive with aorist
b participle.[1] The use of the conditional with initial "when" in 16:8 is entirely suitable as a translation for an aorist participle which is itself best translated by a temporal clause.

83 The past temporal is likewise a suitable translation for more than twenty-five aorist participles which are best rendered in English by temporal clauses.

---

[1] See Blass and Debrunner, p. 247.

84 Finally, note should be taken again of the frequent Coptic practice of translating aorist participles with finite perfects (sec. 38b).

85 There are a considerable number of variations involving the perfect in either A or BO beyond those cases already described in the discussion of the present tense.

a Some are readily explained. From the fact that there are some forty cases where the past temporal (ⲛⲧⲁⲣⲉ-) of A is opposed by an apparent II perfect in BO, one may assume that the form ⲉⲧⲁ- may stand in BO for either the II perfect or the past temporal.[1] Since the past temporal corresponds closely to the aorist participle used verbally, and since, as reported previously, Coptic often translates Greek participles with finite forms, this correspondence with ⲉⲧⲁ- is not surprising. In fact, it is impossible to determine in 6:25 whether the aorist participle is translated in BO by a finite II perfect or by a past temporal.

b The I perfect is used in A. The I perfect prefix in BO is probably not interchangeable with the past temporal,

---

[1] Apparently, among the standard grammars only Georg Steindorff, *Lehrbuch der Koptischen Grammatik* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951), p. 217, comes to the same conclusion. He relates ⲉⲧⲁ- and ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲁ- to a common Egyptian root.

since in the four cases where a past temporal (A)-I perfect (BO) opposition occurs (9:35; 11:4, 17; 12:14), Greek aorist participles underlie. One notes, then, that either a relative perfect, a perfect, or a past temporal may be
c used to translate an aorist participle. No Greek variation is involved in the switch from II perfect in A to I perfect in BO. More than fifteen examples of this opposition occur, with one example of the combination reversed.

86a Other oppositions are not so easily disposed of. In view of the verbs involved (ερωταω and πυνθανομαι) there is probably no variation involved in the perfect (A)-imperfect (BO) opposition in 4:31, 47, 52; 5:12; 18:19. Such verbs by virtue of their meaning prefer an imperfect but can, depending on the context, take an aorist.[1] Of the five examples cited in the Greek the first two are imperfect; the last three, aorist. Clearly, an ambiguity is present when one text translates all with perfect; the
b other, all with imperfect. The previously described (sec. 27) uncertainty about kind of action with regard to verbs of "saying" probably accounts for the reverse, imperfect-perfect opposition in 7:37 and 19:15.

---

[1] Blass and Debrunner, pp. 169 f.

87 In 18:2 the perfect of A is the expected translation for the aorist συνηχθη. The imperfect habitude of BO is clearly explicable, however, on account of the preceding πολλακις in the Greek.

88 The I perfect used by A to translate αγω in 19:4 is appropriate for the present perfective. The I future of BO, however, appears to be a variant, although it may result from puzzlement at this uncommon use of the present tense.

89a The idiomatic phrase αγλα [αβαλ εγμα]αϩε in A (6:66) is perhaps equivalent to the negative imperfect of
b TR and BO. The same is true of the use of λο with the present in 16:19 of A opposite the negative present of TR and BO.

90 The causative infinitive apparently used by A (restored) to translate ερχοντο in 6:17 seems to be a variant. It is difficult to decide whether the perfect of BO represents a different text. As was noted above (sec. 65) Ropes (p. 321) believes the Coptic translators did not make the fine distinctions between aorist and imperfect which Greek writers made. On the other hand, where variation in the use of these tenses occurs, it is almost always explicable. No easy explanation for this

variation is apparent, and if the Coptic translators did make more careful distinctions than Ropes credits them with, the perfect of BO may represent a varying Greek text which had an aorist.

91 A most difficult problem is the question of the use of the Coptic imperfect perfect to translate the Greek aorist. There are some five instances where the aorist is translated expectedly by the I perfect in A; but surprisingly, by the imperfect perfect in BO. If these are not to be labeled variants, they must probably be considered "culminative" aorists which would best be translated
a in English by the pluperfect. Three of the five can probably be placed in this category. Verse 6:18 is preceded by perfects in Greek and an interpretation of the aorist as one of "culminative" type with pluperfect sense is
b quite possible. The context makes the same interpretation
c extremely plausible in 12:16. One is perhaps not forced as strongly toward such an interpretation in 12:18, but the context in general makes it possible. The example in
d 12:18 precedes a perfect infinitive. No exhaustive survey of the more than 350 aorists translated in A by perfects has been made to determine whether BO has good reason only in these three examples to translate with imperfect perfect

rather than the perfect. However, in chapter twelve where
two of the three cases occur, of three other culminative
aorists in the Greek text only one could be pluperfect in
sense. This one instance in 12:1 where Lazarus is described
as ο τεθνηκως ον ηγειρεν εκ νεκρων probably intends by the
use of the aorist to emphasize not the time sequence, but
rather the fact that this event occurred.[1] The Coptic
(A and BO) by using the perfect rather than the imperfect
perfect has for this or some other reason ignored the
e pluperfect time sequence. The perfect-imperfect perfect
opposition in 13:28 does not seem susceptible to the fore-
going explanation and so the imperfect perfect of BO must
f probably be regarded as a variant. The imperfect perfect
of BO in 12:3 translating επληρωθη (perfect in A restored)
g likewise appears to be a variant. The translation by BO
of λαβουσα in 12:3 with imperfect perfect is a possible
interpretation of the Greek (perfect in A restored).

92 There is no Coptic tense which directly corresponds to the Greek perfect, so one is not surprised to see it translated by several different Coptic structures. This

---

[1] According to Dana and Mantey, p. 194, the function of the aorist is to express the simple occurrence of an action in past time.

lack of a closely corresponding Coptic tense is perhaps explanation enough for the imperfect perfect (A)-perfect opposition (BO) which translates εληλυθεισαν in 11:19. Although in the third person plural the forms of the perfect and pluperfect are not close, it is possible that the translator of BO failed to recognize the pluperfect (compare sec. 152 below).

93 On first view the perfect of BO opposite the III future of A seems to vary from the aorist subjunctive of 9:2. The future is the most common translation for the subjunctive. This particular subjunctive is somewhat unusual, however. It appears in a result clause after ινα. According to Dana and Mantey (p. 286), Greek grammarians have been reluctant to admit such usage for ινα. A rare but more acceptable use would be with οτι (ϫε) and the indicative.[1] Such usage would correspond with the perfect of BO. The translator may have had this latter usage in mind and may have seen not a "timeless" aorist subjunctive but instead a "past" aorist. On the other hand, it may be that BO has simply adopted the use of ϫε after an interrogative clause with the sense of "so that" (here with

---

[1] Dana and Mantey, p. 286.

perfect) while A has elected the use of the closely corresponding expression ϫⲉ (ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ) with the II or III future.[1]

94 In two cases the translation of A seems to be a
a variant from the TR. Thus, in 17:12 the perfect of BO agrees with the aorist of the Greek, but the II future of
b A does not. Likewise, the perfect of BO corresponds favorably with the Greek perfect in 14:25, but the conditional of A injects a different sense into the sentence.

95 Variation in voice can rarely be determined, since Coptic verbs may be active or passive. In one instance context does not permit a passive. The perfect active of BO in 16:21 represents a variant from the passive of A and the Greek.

96 Finally among the finite forms, the conjunctive (A)-perfect (BO) opposition in 16:2 poses a problem. The perfect of BO apparently varies from the Greek future. As the editor of A indicates,[2] the translation in A is uncertain. This seems to be a case where a conjunctive is coordinate with the future sense of a preceding

---

[1] See Till, Koptische Grammatik, p. 184.

[2] Thompson, p. 66.

negative future, without itself being negative. A similar example occurs in BO in 6:39. If this is the case, then A varies from the Greek in 16:2.

97a There are a couple of instances where a circumstantial perfect in A is translated by an imperfect perfect in BO. Such is the case in 4:45 where the Greek has the perfect participle. The imperfect perfect in BO is necessary because of the addition of ϫⲉ ("because").
b The same opposition between A and BO occurs in 6:17. Note has previously been made (sec. 38b) of the practice of translating aorist participles by finite Coptic tenses. Here the Greek has a finite perfect. It has already been suggested that perhaps the shift from dependent verbal to finite tense works both ways. In this instance such a shift is not necessary since the ⲉⲙⲡⲉ- of A may simply represent the Achmimic form for the finite tense prefix ⲙⲡⲉ.[1] The use by A of the simple perfect probably arises

---

[1] M. Chaine, Eléments de grammaire dialectale copte (Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1933), p. 275. That there should be Achmimic influence in a sub-Achmimic manuscript of the early fourth century is not surprising if Kahle, I, 219, is correct when he observes that Achmimic influence became so strong in the latter part of the fourth century that it had a marked effect on sub-Achmimic texts of a later period.

from the formal similarity between the perfect εληλυθε and εληλυθει (compare sec. 152). The use by BO, on the other hand, of ⲛⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧ- may suggest the presence of ουπω in the examplar of BO.

98 In 14:7 the Greek pluperfect in a contrary-to-fact conditional sentence is translated in BO according to usual practice (see sec. 138a) by a circumstantial imperfect. The perfect with ⲉϣⲡⲉ used by A is anomalous and with the future which follows in the apodosis probably constitutes a variant.

99a Note has already been made (sec. 97) of the fact that the ⲉⲙⲡⲉ- prefix such as appears in 8:40 may be not a circumstantial perfect but rather the Achmimic form of the negative perfect. As such, it corresponds to the negative

b perfect of BO. In 19:33 a real opposition occurs between the circumstantial perfect of A and the perfect of BO as translation for ηδη. However, since a perfect participle follows ηδη the finite tense of BO may be a change parallel to the switch from participle to finite tense seen else-

c where (sec. 38b). The same is true of the reverse opposition in 5:5 and 11:39. The switch from the present of the Greek to perfect has previously been explained (secs. 20, 5b). The switch of A to a finite form, likewise, is a phenomenon already accounted for (sec. 38b).

100 The perfect of A translating the present of 11:39 has already been designated a variant (sec. 5a). The circumstantial perfect of BO seems to deserve the same designation. Perhaps both are dependent on the Greek of TR but have been misled by ηδη to translate with a past tense.

101 There are a number of variations involving the relative. In several instances A has emphasized by the non-verbal with relative perfect predicate what in BO appears as a perfect (4:38; 5:37; 6:27, 32, 46, 70; 9:11; 12:16, 49; 15:16; 18:26; 19:21; 20:15). In all of these cases the Greek agrees with BO in having a finite tense. Notably, in 12:12 the dependent phrase with the participle ελθων is transformed into an independent expression in both A and BO. The conversion in BO to finite perfect is a change with numerous parallels already cited (see sec. 38b). The use in A of a non-verbal with relative predicate is unusual but probably involves no variant.

102 In 11:45 an adjectival aorist participle is translated literally by a relative substantive in BO. The finite II perfect of A is, however, a change observed frequently elsewhere (sec. 38b) and represents no variant.

103 The remaining examples involve a variant on the
a part of one or the other of the two texts. The relative
future of A in 6:37 is a possible interpretation of the
Greek present with relative, but the relative perfect of
b BO appears to be a variant. On the other hand, in 14:26
the relative perfect of BO agrees with the Greek relative
with aorist, but the relative future of A varies.

104 Finally, in 6:45 of BO the conjunctive after the
the relative future varies from the aorist participle of
the Greek. A curious usage appears in A. Apparently a
I perfect is used here, but the perfect is coordinate with
the preceding relative perfect in such a way that it can
be translated only as a relative.

105a Only a few variations occur between A and F. Both
the II perfect of A and the I perfect of F in 9:15, 22 are
b suitable translations of the Greek aorist. Another matter
is the use by F of an apparent II perfect opposite the
past temporal of A in 6:24. In view of the use already
described (sec. 85a) in BO of the ⲉⲧⲁ- prefix for both
past temporal and II perfect, one may infer the same
practice in F. It must be noted, however, that elsewhere
F agrees with A in using the ⲛⲧⲁⲣⲉ- form (for example,
in 6:14, 19).

106a In 6:26 the II future of A has already been desig-
nated a variant (sec. 67). In using the perfect, F agrees
b with the Greek. On the other hand, the circumstantial
perfect of A agrees with ευχαριστησαντος in 6:23, but the
relative perfect of F is awkward. This is an unusual
usage for translating a verbal participle. It seems
unlikely, however, that a different Greek text is involved.

107 Finally, note has been taken previously (sec. 77a)
of the use of οτε in 9:14 as a relative in the translation
of A. The usual use of the word in its temporal signifi-
cance appears in the translation of F where a past temporal
is used.

Greek Future Tense

108a Within the text encompassed by A the Greek future
is translated slightly more than 110 times by the Coptic I
b future. The II and III futures are, as far as Greek is
concerned, equivalent to the I future. The former is used
for the Greek future in 5:47; 6:5, 68; 8:22; 15:8 (con-
junctive after II future), 21; 16:13^{2}, 14, 25^{2}; and the
c latter, in 10:28; 13:38; and 19:24 (fragmentary). In one

case (15:7 of A) a conjunctive is apparently used independently with future sense.[1]

109 Several instances occur where the Greek future is
a translated by the Coptic I present in A. In 6:37; 14:23; 16:7 the future sense is conveyed by the use of the
b futuristic word ⲛⲛⲏⲩ. In two cases the future sense
c results from a conjunctive following ⲛⲛⲏⲩ (14:3, 23). The conjunctive after a non-verbal in 16:16 seems to be used independently with future sense for ⲟⲩⲉϭϫⲉ (compare sec. 108c). The same thing occurs in 16:17, 19. BO has future in each case except 16:19 where -ⲛⲁ- before ⲛⲁⲩ has
d probably dropped out. The present of ⲟⲩⲛ in 16:33 is the nearest equivalent available with this construction to express the future εξετε.

110 There are three instances where the future circumstantial is used to translate the Greek future (4:21, 23; 5:25). In each case the Greek future is preceded by οτε used with relative sense. In each case in the Coptic the indefinite "an hour comes" is followed by a circumstantial relative future.

---

[1] Cf. Till, Koptische Grammatik, p. 165.

111 Again, there are three cases where the emphatic non-verbal with relative future predicate replaces the finite future in the Greek (5:45; 13:21; 16:26).

112a In two cases variants may occur. In 19:15 of A after the crowd has shouted "Crucify him," Pilate, instead of asking "τον βασιλεα υμων σταυρωσω," simply repeats the words of the crowd, presumably as a question: "ⲁⲣⲓⲥⲧⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ[ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲣⲣⲟ]." The Coptic clearly varies from the Greek, but may not be based on a different text, since the sense is not changed. The use here of the imperative as a question unavoidably involves futurity. The conjunctive used by BO is apparently used independently with future

b sense (see sec. 108c). In 8:36 the future of A agrees with ελευθεροι εσεσθε of the TR. BO has the non-verbal ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛ ϩⲁⲛⲣⲉⲙϩⲉ which can be interpreted with future sense, but may be based on a different Greek text.

113 In 18:39 a purpose clause following the verb "wish" employs the bare indicative future. The Coptic, instead of the future, uses another way of expressing purpose (also often used in Greek)--the infinitive. The conjunctive used by BO is a Bohairic equivalent to the sub-Achmimic construction.

114 There are only a few examples of the future used with the Greek relative. There are enough, however, to show that the patterns observed in the present and aorist
a tenses prevail also in the future. The relative future used to translate adjectival Greek relatives with future occurs without the article (4:14; 6:51; 14:26), with the article (15:26), and with the demonstrative in place of
b the article (4:14). The relative substantive is also used for the Greek substantival relative with future (13:26).

115a A future participle in 6:64 is part of a sentence which has the structure of a Coptic non-verbal with relative predicate. It is translated, appropriately, by
b a non-verbal sentence with relative future predicate. A substantival future participle in 17:20 is translated by a Coptic relative future.

116 Many cases involving the use of the future in oppositions between A and BO have already been illuminated in the discussion of the present and aorist tenses. A goodly number of oppositions between A and BO involving
a the future remain. No distinction can be made between I (A) and III (BO) future where a Greek future is translated (5:25; 6:37, 44, 45, 51; 7:38; 8:12, 52; 10:9; 14:21, 23; 16:13,22 [two cases, one with the final -ⲉ- of ⲉϥⲉ- omitted],

b 23, 26).[1] The same is true where the subjunctive is trans-
c lated (6:35^{2}; 8:51; 11:26). Similarly, the futures of 16:3,
13 are equally well translated by either the II (A) or
d III future (BO). In 16:25 A, BO, and the Greek all have
οτε and all have future; however, the II future occurs
e in A and the III future in BO. Although a slightly
different interpretation occurs, no variant is involved in
4:21, 23 when A interprets οτε as a relative and translates
with circumstantial relative future, while BO transliterates
οτε and uses III future.

117 No difference may be discerned vis-à-vis the Greek where A uses II future; and BO, I future (5:47; 10:32; 11:11; 14:12; 16:5, 10, 17), or vice versa (12:26; 14:17^{2}). All of these instances translate futuristic presents except 5:47 and 12:26 which translate Greek futures. The futures of BO in 12:26 and 14:17 are either circumstantial futures used independently (see sec. 41) or else mark instances where the scribe, perhaps through lapse, has written the II tense with initial ⲉ- as in Sahidic.

---

[1] It should be noted that in the view of Kahle, I, 152 ff., many apparent III future forms in A may actually be II futures with ⲛ omitted.

118 The most common difference between A and BO is in their treatment of Greek subjunctives with ινα. Bohairic generally translates the Greek subjunctive with the conjunctive (ⲛⲧⲉ-) usually with ϩⲓⲛⲁ, but occasionally with ϫⲉ.[1] In A, on the other hand, these Greek subjunctives are rendered by the II or III future, usually after ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ,
a but also with ϫⲉ.[2] In A and BO this future-conjunctive correspondence occurs some ten times with the III future in A translating a present subjunctive, and more than twenty-five times with it translating the aorist subjunctive.
b The II future appears in this correspondence over fifteen times as a translation of the present subjunctive and nearly thirty times for the aorist subjunctive.

119 Several minor exceptions to the Bohairic pattern of conjunctive with particle occur. Apparently BO occasionally uses the conjunctive without ϩⲓⲛⲁ as a translation of the Greek ινα clause (11:50). The conjunctive without particle is also used in BO after verbs of will, exhortation, demand, and commandment as a translation of

---

[1] See Mallon, pp. 120 f.

[2] Again see Kahle, I, 152 ff., for the view that in A the II and III futures are often indistinguishable.

the Greek subjunctive.[1] BO apparently employs this usage in 6:15 opposite a II future in A and an aorist subjunctive in the Greek although, in contrast with the Greek, the entire series of conjunctives could be coordinate. In 11:16 the same usage of the conjunctive without ϩινα occurs opposite a III future in A as translation for the hortatory subjunctive of the Greek. Here also, however, the conjunctive could be coordinate with the preceding jussive.

120 The III future-conjunctive (with ϩινα) opposition is used opposite an indicative perfect in 12:7 of the TR. The Greek of the TR is oblique.[2] It translates literally: "Let her alone. She has kept it unto the day of my preparation for burial." If this text lies behind the Coptic translation, the Coptic translators have treated the phrase as if it were a purpose clause using the preposition εις with the accusative articular infinitive. Since, however, the text has the perfect rather than the infinitive, it seems likely that a variant lies behind the Coptic.

121 In 9:36 where BO uses ϩινα with the conjunctive,

---

[1] Mallon, pp. 119 f.

[2] See C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (London: S. P. C. K., 1958), p. 345.

the use of A is obscure. Thompson (p. XVIII) assigns the prefix ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲁ- to the conjunctive future. This would correspond favorably to a probable (ⲉ[ⲓⲉ]) III future in F. If Thompson is correct, no variant from the Greek is involved.

122 Perhaps the most striking opposition between the two texts is the use by BO of a form not found in other extant texts (ⲁⲛⲛⲉ-) to translate Greek negative subjunctives. In every case except one, the form translates εαν μη with the subjunctive (14:6 has ει μη without a verb
a in A and Greek). A translates some of these cases with ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ and the conjunctive (5:19; 6:44, 65; 7:51^{2}; 15:4),
b others with the conditional (4:48; 6:53; 8:24; 10:38;
c 12:24; 13:8; 15:6; 16:7; 20:25^{2}), and a single example with the circumstantial future (15:4). Kasser has a rather elaborate theory to account for the form.[1] He theorizes that before the fixation of the orthography of the various dialects a primitive prefix with vocalization varying in between ⲁ and ⲉ stood for the circumstantial, II present, conditional, and III future. Out of this, the most frequently used construction, the II present, maintained

---

[1] Le Muséon, LXXVI (1963), 267 ff.

the original form (along with the circumstantial whose syntax clearly distinguished it from the II present without formal variation), and the conditional and III future developed the distinctive -ϣⲁⲛ- and -ⲉ- respectively. Kasser cites as evidence the ultimate formal identity between the nominal prefixes of II present and III future (ⲉⲣⲉ-), the appearance in BO of III futures with pronoun subjects which lack the final prefix ⲉ, the presence in BO of positive conditionals (ⲁⲣⲉ-) which, lacking -ϣⲁⲛ- are formally identical with the II present, and the use of a negative conditional having formal resemblances to the d negative III future (ⲁⲛⲛⲉ-). Whether or not this theory is sufficient grounds for labeling ⲁⲛⲛⲉ- a primitive negative conditional form does not greatly affect its translation. It is clearly conditional in tone. The subjunctive condition which it translates might equally well be translated by an interrogative negative III future. ⲁⲛⲛⲉ- could be construed as just such a form--that is, as the negative III future preceded by the interrogative particle ⲁⲛ which Crum (p. 56) says precedes the subjunctive.

123 A purpose clause in Greek may be translated into English either with another purpose clause or with an infinitive phrase. Likewise in Greek, purpose clauses may

be expressed, among several ways, either by ινα with the
a subjunctive or by the simple infinitive. So also in Coptic
there is no distinction in meaning between the II future
of A in 18:39 and the causative infinitive of BO. Both
are appropriate translations for ινα with the subjunctive.
b Similarly, the Greek subjunctive purpose clause may be
translated either as in A with the infinitive or as in BO
with the conjunctive (equals II or III future in A,
subjunctive in Greek) (6:38; 11:31; 12:20, 47; 15:17;
c 17:4); and the infinitive used to express purpose may be
translated either by the infinitive in A or the conjunctive
d in BO (4:40; 13:24; 14:2 [lacuna in A]; 18:14). A uses
the conjunctive to express purpose in translating the
purposive infinitive υπαγειν in 11:44; 18:8.

124 In 14:7 a Greek contrary-to-fact conditional sentence with pluperfects is translated in BO suitably by circumstantial imperfect in the protasis and by imperfect future in the apodosis. As indicated previously (sec. 98) the combination in A of ⲉϣⲡⲉ with I perfect in the protasis followed by future in the apodosis appears to be a variant reading.

125 In 12:26 a Greek conditional clause with εαν is translated suitably by ⲉϣⲡⲉ with the I future. The conditional (without -ϣⲁⲛ-) of BO is equally appropriate.

126 It has previously been noted (sec. 2b) that in 6:9 the II future of A arises from a present tense which can be translated futuristically. The non-verbal present of BO interprets the Greek present literally.

127a Two examples involve variants. In 15:5 A translates the Greek non-verbal phrase (καγω εν αυτω) literally with a non-verbal of its own. The I future of BO, with some plausibility, interprets on the basis of the preceding

b participle seen futuristically. As the editor of A points out,[1] the III future of 5:30 is an error, since the III future cannot be negated by an ⲉⲛ such as follows in the text of 5:30. The II present of BO agrees with the present of the Greek.

128 In two cases (5:7; 8:44) the subjunctive is translated suitably on one hand by the future circumstantial (A) and on the other by the conditional (BO). In 5:7 the usage in A is very puzzling until one looks at BO. At first glance one sees in A what appears to be a II future after ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ followed by a conjunctive. This analysis, however, will not fit the obviously conditional context. An examination of BO at this point leads one to conclude

---

[1] Thompson, p. 7.

that the conjunctive of A is not the usual coordinate one but rather represents an intrusion of the Bohairic idiom whereby the conjunctive is used to translate subjunctive clauses with ινα. The apparent initial II future is then seen to be a circumstantial future used conditionally.

129 BO makes emphatic by means of the non-verbal with relative future predicate three cases where A in agreement with the Greek has the finite I future (14:26; 15:26; 16:14).

130 Another opposition between the two texts involves
the contrast between the use of conditional (A) over
a against the relative future substantive (BO). In 12:26;
14:14, 23 where Greek has εαν with the subjunctive, the
statements are closely akin to the maxim-like sayings
which have already (sec. 2a) been observed as translatable
b by either the tense of habitude or the future. Verse 10:9
fits the same pattern, except, here, the subjunctive with
εαν is translated by the present of ⲛⲛⲏⲩ, which is futur-
c istic in sense. Verses 9:22; 11:57 use the same conditional-
relative future opposition for a subjunctive with εαν. No
maxim-like saying is involved. In light of the pattern
set by the other cases, however, there is probably no
d variant here. The Greek of 20:23 (αν τινων αφητε; αν

τινων κρατητε) corresponds to the usage of BO (relative future substantive) in the preceding examples. Here, however, although A uses the relative future substantive and BO agrees in the first instance, in the second BO uses the conditional. In all of these cases A translates literally, while BO uses the conditional for the Greek relative and the relative future for the Greek conditional.

131 Similar to the foregoing opposition is the contrast between the III future of A and the relative future substantive of BO in 6:50. The aorist subjunctive underlying does not explicitly involve conditional sense here, although such an interpretation is possible.

132 F admits of only a few oppositions to A. First of all, the I future (A)-II future (F) opposition in 15:6 translating a futuristic aorist involves no variation as far as the Greek is concerned.

133 In contrast to the preceding opposition the conjunctive (F) opposite the future in A in 14:23 appears to be a variant.

134 In light of earlier discussion (sec. 123) concerning the suitability of either the infinitive or the conjunctive (BO) or II or III future (A) for expressing a purpose clause, it is apparent that no variation is

involved in the contrast between the use of the infinitive by A and the use of the III future by F to translate a subjunctive in 12:47.

135 In 9:34, F has a variant which errs in the choice of a prefix pronoun (ϥ) which disagrees with the independent subject pronoun (ⲚⲦⲀⲔ). However, the use of a II future by F opposite the non-verbal with relative future predicate of A represents only a lessening of emphasis.

136 Finally, the same opposition discerned above (sec. 130) where BO opposed a conditional in A with a relative future substantive occurs also between A and F. In 12:47, F uses the relative future substantive opposite the conditional of A to translate the Greek subjunctive with εαν.

Greek Imperfect Tense

137a The most common practice of the translator of A in rendering the Greek imperfect is to use the Coptic imperfect. This correspondence occurs over a hundred
b times. Another clearly satisfactory correspondence is the use of the imperfect future to translate the Greek imperfect with αν when used in the apodosis of contrary-to-fact
c clauses (5:46; 8:39, 42; 15:19; 18:36). The use of the

imperfect with αν serving in a Greek apodosis is also translated by the simple imperfect in 9:41 (ⲚⲈⲘⲚⲚⲀⲂⲈ ⲀⲢⲰⲦⲚ). The imperfect future is not used here possibly because with the suffix verb ⲘⲚ there is no infinitive following the subject to which the future (ⲚⲀ) may be prefixed.

138a The protasis of contrary-to-fact clauses with and the imperfect is rendered appropriately by the circumstantial imperfect (9:33, 41; 15:19; 18:36). As noted previously (sec. 29a), in 11:21, 32; 14:28 the circumstantial is implicit. BO has explicit circumstantial
b imperfect in these instances. In 18:30 the form is a circumstantial imperfect negative perfect. The use of a converted perfect to translate the imperfect sense of ην κακοποιος does not seem likely. It appears that the translation of A derives from a differing Greek text.

139 A curious variant occurs in 5:46. Here the Greek, using the imperfect (ει) επιστευετε, apparently refers to the Law (μωση),[1] and BO concurs. The translator of A, however, using the (circumstantial) converted perfect, makes reference to the historical leader Moses.

---

[1] See Dana and Mantey, pp. 289 f.

140 There are two instances where the imperfect, in agreement with the practice observed with regard to the other Greek tenses is translated emphatically by a non-verbal with relative present predicate, past by context (2:22, 25).

141 Examples where the Greek imperfect has been translated by the II present are discussed in section 26d.

142a Some of the instances where the Greek imperfect
is translated by a Coptic perfect have already been
discussed: 4:31, 47 (sec. 86a); 12:17 (sec. 66c); 12:21
b (sec. 42b); 12:47 (sec. 66b). In 14:40 and 9:15 A and BO
alike have perfects opposite the Greek imperfect. The
tendency of words like the one used in these cases (ερωταω)
to appear in the imperfect in Greek has already been
c noted (secs. 42b, 86a). The imperfect-perfect opposition
in 6:3 is problematic. The imperfect of καθημαι used here
in the sense of to "dwell" or "remain" may perhaps be
parallel to verbs like "believe" whose quality of action
d is often ambiguous. A similar situation obtains in the
case of εδοξαν in 11:13 where BO uses imperfect (partial
lacuna in A). On account of this ambiguity, vacillation
between imperfect and perfect is perhaps understandable.

143 The two instances involving an imperfect-II perfect

opposition where the verb is λεγω (6:6; 8:27) may be reconciled on the basis of the ambiguous usage between aorist and imperfect with regard to verbs of "saying" (sec. 27).

144 There are several instances where the imperfect is
a translated by the Coptic present. The examples in 10:41;
12:6; 17:6; 18:14 are non-verbals which are past by context.
b The Coptic presents of 5:18 and 6:22 (ⲙⲛ) translating the
Greek imperfect are anomalous. The context in each case
seems to require a past tense. In fact, Thompson (p. 56)
in his translation of 6:22 renders the present as a past
tense. On the basis of these examples one is pushed
toward the conclusion that Coptic too possesses a "historical
present." If it does, however, it is used sparingly.

145 In several instances the Coptic translation of a Greek imperfect seems to be a variant. As noted previously (sec. 90), in 6:17 A apparently (restored) translates the imperfect by a causative infinitive. In 11:36 where A is lacking, BO uses the I present in place of the Greek imperfect εφιλει. In 4:30 ηρχοντο, omitted by A, is translated by the perfect in BO. The present of ⲙⲛ in BO (lacuna in A) for ειχες in 19:11 also appears to be a variant.

146 Attention has been called previously (sec. 38b) to the fact that Greek sometimes uses participles for finite verbs. The same practice was presumed for Coptic in the use of the circumstantial present for the Greek imperfect in BO (12:6, 13) and A (18:18; 19:3). In 13:29 a circumstantial present in BO opposite a non-verbal past by context in A translates the Greek imperfect. Further examples where A and BO concur in this substitution for the imperfect appear in 5:18; 11:38.

147a Note has already been made (sec. 49d) of the fact that a Coptic relative imperfect occurs only twice in A (9:13, 24). In 9:13 it renders the sense of ποτε. In 9:24 it translates a Greek relative with imperfect.

b Generally the relative with imperfect is translated in A by a relative present which is past by context. Such is the case in 2:23; 4:46 (circumstantial relative); 6:2; 7:42 (circumstantial relative); 10:40; 11:6; 17:5; 18:16.

c In 6:21 the relative with imperfect is one which may be classified, using the term of Dana and Mantey (p. 189), as "tendential." The relative future of A is thus singularly appropriate.

148 All of the examples of "the place which" with relative present in A used to translate the Greek οπου

with imperfect are paralleled by the relative imperfect in BO and have consequently been dealt with in section 49a.

149 Attention must be given to a number of conflicts between A and BO involving the imperfect in addition to those discussed in connection with previously described tenses. That the imperfect of ϫⲱ is equivalent to the suffix conjugation ⲡⲉϫⲉ⸗ seems clear from the frequent interchange between the two in A and BO. In 6:42; 8:19, 25; 11:36; 19:21 A has the imperfect. On the other hand, BO has the imperfect in 9:8, 9; 16:18. In every case where one has imperfect, the other has ⲡⲉϫⲉ⸗. The Greek imperfect is translated in each instance.[1]

150a The use of imperfect perfect by BO in 6:4; 7:2; 11:55 where Greek and A have imperfect is puzzling. In each case the phrase ην εγγυς is at issue. Possibly the combination of the imperfect of ειμι with the adjective describing a state or condition appeared to the translator

b to parallel the Greek pluperfect. The uncertainty regarding the use by A of the perfect to translate επιστευον in 12:47 has already been noted (sec. 66a). The imperfect

---

[1] As is well known, ⲡⲉϫⲉ⸗ also frequently translates the aorist.

perfect used by BO, however, apparently results from a variant text.

151 The use by BO of an imperfect "not yet" (νεμπατ-) in 7:5 to translate the Greek imperfect seems to be a variant resulting from an assimilation to the ουπω of the next sentence (7:6). A agrees with the Greek.

152 In 7:30 and 8:20 ουπω εληλυθει is translated by the "not yet" tense in A, but by the imperfect "not yet" in BO. On the other hand, in 7:8 and 20:17 A and BO agree in using simple μπατ- to translate ουπω with the perfect. Since A and BO agree in using simple μπατ- in 7:8 and 20:17 for the perfect, one is drawn toward the conclusion that A, in contrast to BO, has failed in 7:30; 8:20 to distinguish the pluperfect εληλυθει from the very similar perfect εληλυθε.

153 Finally, there is one instance where the imperfect of A and the Greek is contrasted in BO with an emphatic non-verbal with relative imperfect predicate (12:2). It is interesting to note that here in BO, also in the case of an imperfect relative predicate, a non-verbal with third-person subject can occur without a copula.

154 Contrasting A and F, one finds only one remaining example involving the imperfect. In section 66a reference

was made to the fact that the imperfect of A in 9:18 may result from the (stative) nature of the word "believe." It is difficult, however, to see how the imperfect perfect of F could be a translation of the aorist of the Greek. Perhaps it is an error for the imperfect future "they would not believe."

Greek Perfect Tense

155 It has been necessary to indicate previously on several occasions that there is no single verbal construction in Coptic which precisely corresponds to the Greek perfect.[1] Consequently, the appropriateness of the various Coptic constructions used to translate it must be
a determined individually. Thus, although the Coptic perfect is the normative translation for the Greek aorist, since it is used over sixty-five times in A to translate the perfect, it also must be considered the usual translation
b for the perfect. The II perfect also translates the perfect a number of times (6:25, 38; 7:28; 8:42; 11:34;

---

[1] This is to be expected, since as was indicated in a footnote to section 5a, the perfect in the New Testament combines in itself the present and the aorist.

c 12:30; 18:3$\overset{2}{7}$). In view of the fact that the Greek perfect indicates a present state which is the consequence of a past action, it is not surprising that it is sometimes d translated by a present qualitative (2:17; 8:17). In light of this stative quality of the perfect, it is likewise appropriate that the passive perfect be translated by a Coptic II (7:47) or I (11:27; 17:10) present.

156 In one instance, however, the present seems an inappropriate translation of the perfect. The desire for smoothness seems to be operative in 14:7. Here the Greek translates: "From now you know him and you have seen him." The translator apparently tries to correct the lack of logical order by making the two verbs contemporaneous.

157a The perfects of 7:52 and 20:23, since they are futuristic in sense, are appropriately translated by the b I future in A. As noted previously (sec. 2e) the future of 6:36 is a variant.

158 As indicated in section 94b the conditional of 14:25 used as a translation of the perfect is also a variant.

159 The pattern described for other tenses appears in two instances where the perfect is used with καθως. In

12:50 and 15:10 A has "according to the way which" with relative perfect.

160 Likewise, the emphatic non-verbal sentence with relative perfect predicate appears for the finite perfect in 4:38; 5:37; 6:32; 6:46; 12:29; and in 17:23 of BO where there is a lacuna in A.

161 τουτο αληθες ειρηκας in 4:18 is interpreted in the predicative sense and translated as a non-verbal sentence with an adjectival relative perfect.

162 In 3:2 the Greek phrase in which διδασκαλος is in apposition with the subject of the sentence is difficult to analyze. The translator of A has appropriately clarified matters by making the verb a relative (circumstantial) clause modifying the predicate nominative "teacher."

163 The pattern of practice in translating the Greek

a relative conforms to that of the other tenses. The Greek adjectival relative is translated by a relative perfect without article (8:40 [circumstantial relative]; 10:29; 15:3, 24 [circumstantial relative]; 17:4, 6, 8, 22; 18:11).

b In two instances (17:2, 7) the adjectival use after πας is translated by ⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ with the relative perfect. One such case (6:39) with πας employs an alternate construction,

c the relative perfect substantive followed by ⲧⲏⲣ. A final
example (18:9) which has the Greek adjectival relative
preceding its antecedent is translated, as with the other
d tenses, by a relative perfect substantive. The relative
perfect substantive is also used to translate the Greek
substantival relative where it functions as the object of
e a verb (3:11 [ⲡⲉⲧⲁ-]; 19:22), the object of an infinitive
f (4:38), or the object of a preposition (17:9). One example
where a Greek substantival relative used as object of the
verb precedes the verb is translated by a non-verbal
sentence in which the relative object has become the
subject and the main verb has become the relative predicate
(8:38). This is doubtless an attempt to duplicate the
g emphatic nature of the Greek sentence. In 5:45 the perfect
with relative has present sense in Greek and is thus translated in A and BO by the relative present.

164 The perfect participle shows the broad range of
possible legitimate Coptic translations for the Greek
a perfect. In two cases it is translated by a past temporal
b (4:6; 6:19). Where the Greek substantive participle is
used, A translates with the relative perfect substantive:
for the subject of the verb (3:6; 11:44; 13:10; 14:9;
c 19:35), for the object of the verb (18:21). The adjectival

participle is translated by a relative perfect without article (3:8; 8:31) and by the relative perfect with the
d demonstrative (12:1). In 12:29 of BO (lacuna in A) the relative perfect is used for an adjectival participle.

165a The use of the phrase ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲧⲛⲛⲁⲟⲩϥ to translate απεσταλμενος in 9:7 is puzzling. The usual Coptic oblique passive employs the third-person plural indefinite. Perhaps the use of the third-person singular coupled with the following third-person singular object is an attempt to duplicate the Greek middle with a Coptic reflexive.[1]
b A similar occurrence in 9:32 (ⲉⲁϥϫⲡⲁϥ) may involve an oblique reference to God.

166a A number of verbal perfect participles are rendered agreeably by the circumstantial perfect (4:45; 9:32; 13:2;
b 18:18; 19:33). Among these, 9:32 follows with an additional
c circumstantial: ⲟⲩⲃⲗⲗⲉ ⲉⲁϥϫⲡⲁϥ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛⲃⲗ[ⲗⲉ]. The presence of ⲟⲩⲱ (ηδη) in 13:2 and 19:33 produces a similar repetition of the circumstantial.

167 The perfect participle is also rendered by the
a relative present. The relation of the present tense to

---

[1] For this suggestion I am indebted to Professor Orval Wintermute.

the Greek perfect has already been noted (sec. 156c). The
suitability of the present to translate a passive participle
b is especially clear. In 15:25 this suitability is even
clearer, since it is a present qualitative which is used
c to translate the perfect passive. A non-qualitative
present suitably translates a perfect passive in 11:52
d (restored). The present sense of the perfect of ιστημι is
also clear,[1] and the present qualitative is an agreeable
translation for it (6:22; 11:42; 12:29).

168a The circumstantial qualitative is an appropriate
translation for a number of verbal perfect participles--
for the words δεω (11:44; 18:24 [restored]) and κλειω
(20:19, 26) as well as for ιστημι (11:56; 19:26; 20:14).
b The word πληροω (17:13), like ιστημι, has present sense
in the perfect.[2]

169 Finally, as has previously been noted (sec. 52), the relative present substantive of 6:13 is past by context and thus does not vary from the substantive perfect participle it translates.

---

[1] See Blass and Debrunner, p. 176.

[2] *Ibid*.

170 For variations of F and BO from A which involve the Greek perfect see sections 35, 36b, 39, 44c, 50a, 52, 94, 97a, 97b, 99, 106a, 120.

Greek Pluperfect Tense

171a In the Coptic imperfect perfect, the Greek pluperfect has a closer parallel than is available for the Greek perfect. It is not surprising to find this correspondence in several instances (4:8; 6:17; 9:22 [with ογω and following circumstantial present because of
b preceding ηδη]; 11:19, 57). Similarly, the use of an imperfect "not yet" tense (ⲛⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧ-) for the pluperfect
c with ουπω in 11:30 and the imperfect future for the pluperfects with αν in 8:19; 11:21 is appropriate.

172a In a number of instances a Coptic imperfect is a suitable translation for the pluperfect. Since ηδειν is a pluperfect used with imperfect meaning, its translation in 6:6, 64; 13:11; 18:2; 20:14 by an imperfect is entirely
b suitable. Likewise ηδειν used with ει in the protasis of a contrary-to-fact clause is accurately translated by a circumstantial imperfect in 4:10 and 8:19. The translation of ηδειν in 11:42 by the I present, while it is inaccurate,

is understandable. When Jesus says "ηδειν that you always
hear me," he refers to the fact that a few moments previous
when he called Lazarus from the tomb he "knew." Unless
this fact is clear, the use of the past tense is awkward
in the Greek; thus the use of the present by A is an
c understandable attempt at improvement. As has been indi-
cated (sec. 167d), the perfect of ιστημι has present sense.
Thus, the use of imperfect qualitative to translate the
pluperfect of ιστημι in 18:5, 16, 18; 19:25 is appropriate.
d The imperfect qualitative of A in 7:37 for ειστηκει follows
the same pattern. Since not even the imperfect is a
literal translation here, the perfect used by BO cannot be
considered a variant.

173 The perfect as a translation for the pluperfect in the contrary-to-fact clause of 14:7 has previously been designated a variant (sec. 124).

174 The circumstantial qualitative of 11:44, being coordinate with the preceding phrase, seems a satisfactory rendering of the hapax form περιεδεδετο. Although this form is a finite pluperfect passive, it is coordinate with the preceding perfect passive participle.

175 For variations of BO from A (there are none in F) where the Greek pluperfect is involved see sections 26b, 36e, 92, 98, 124, 153.

The Greek Subjunctive

176 When translating the Greek subjunctive, the Coptic
makes no distinction between the present and aorist sub-
junctives of the Greek; yet, for the sake of convenience
they may here be treated separately. Again for the sake
of convenience, the variations of both A and BO from the
a Greek may be treated together. Discussion has previously
been introduced (sec. 118b) detailing the correspondence
between the II future of A and the conjunctive (ⲛⲧⲉ-) of
b BO as a translation of the present subjunctive. Section
118a describes the same parallel between the III future
of A and the conjunctive of BO.

177 There are a variety of possible translations for
a the subjunctive conditional clause. The use of the
I future with ⲉϣⲡⲉ (A) opposite the conditional (BO) has
already been noted (sec. 125). A couple of other con-
trasting translations for the Greek subjunctive conditional
b have also been detailed previously: the circumstantial
c future (A)-conditional (BO) contrast (sec. 128); the
d infinitive (A)-conjunctive opposition (sec. 123b). The
use of the ⲁⲛⲛⲉ- negative conditional in BO opposite the
ordinary conditional negated by ⲧⲙ used by A (translating

the present subjunctive only in 10:38) has likewise been
e described (sec. 122b and following). The use of the
positive conditional to translate Greek present subjunctive
conditional sentences is common to A and BO in 5:31; 6:62;
8:14, 16, 31, 54; 11:9; 13:17; 15:14. Similar agreement
occurs also in 11:10 where, however, the positive con-
f ditional in BO omits -ϣⲁⲛ- (see sec. 29b).[1] The Coptic
conditional in one text is paralleled by several structures
used with ⲉϣⲡⲉ in the other: with future (A) (12:26
[conditional in BO without -ϣⲁⲛ-]); with ⲟⲩⲛ (BO) (13:35);
g with the circumstantial (BO) (14:15). The conditional of
A as a translation for the present subjunctive with εαν is
also paralleled in BO by the use of the relative future
h substantive (see sec. 130a). A similar example where both
A and BO use the relative present substantive to translate
i a conditional subjunctive occurs in 7:37. The ⲁⲛⲛⲉ-
negative conditional, in addition to paralleling the
ordinary conditional in A, also appears in BO opposite
ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ and the conjunctive of A as a translation for the
present subjunctive (5:19) (see sec. 122a).

---

[1] In examining these as well as like examples in 5:43 and 6:51, Professor Orval Wintermute notes that all involve ⲟⲩⲁⲓ as subject. However, as he further observes, the example ⲁⲣⲉϣⲁⲟⲩⲁⲓ- occurs in 11:9.

178 The hortatory present subjunctive is translated in
both A and BO by the jussive (ⲙⲁⲣⲉ-) (11:7, 15, 16; 14:31).

179 The use of consecutive circumstantial present and
circumstantial future in A opposite the conditional followed
by circumstantial present in BO to translate οταν τικτη
in 16:21 has been noted in section 43b.

180a The present subjunctive with εαν μη is agreeably
translated in 3:2 (A) by ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ with present circumstantial.
b Similarly A and BO agree in the use of present circum-
stantial with ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ as translation for an εαν clause in 9:31.

181a With regard to the translation of the relative
with subjunctive, the use of the relative future substantive
b in 20:23 has been discussed previously (sec. 130d). Like-
wise, the maxim-like Greek subjunctive used in 5:19 as an
adjectival relative is translated equally well by the
relative future substantive of A and the relative habitude
substantive (with initial demonstrative rather than
article) of BO.

182 A number of constructions used to translate the
a aorist subjunctive have been dealt with previously. The
II future (A)-conjunctive (BO) opposition has been noted
b in section 118b, and the II future (A)-infinitive (BO)
c opposition of 18:39 has been noted in section 123a. The

related infinitive (A)-conjunctive conflict is treated in
d section 123b. BO is lacking in 4:8, but A, according to
the pattern noted in section 123b, translates the ινα
clause by an infinitive.

183a In most cases where the III future of A translates
the aorist subjunctive, BO has conjunctive (sec. 118a).
b There are, however, a considerable number of cases where
both A and BO have the III negative future as translation
of the aorist subjunctive (5:14; 6:39, 50 [conjunctive
after III future in A]; 12:35, 40, 42; 16:1; 18:28, 36;
c 19:31). Only in 12:46 does BO use a negative conjunctive
to translate an aorist subjunctive with ινα (the III future
d of A is completely restored). The use by A of the III
future opposite the perfect of BO to translate the aorist
e subjunctive is treated in section 93. For the III future
(A) opposite a relative future substantive (BO) see
f section 131. The introduction of ⲟⲩⲱϣ by BO in 8:56 is
a variant.

184 In a number of cases A translates the aorist
a subjunctive with I future. Although the text of BO is
lacking in 4:14, omitted in 10:28, and apparently in error
b in 14:15, BO agrees in using I future in 4:48; 18:11. The
I future (A)-III future (BO) opposition as a translation

c for the aorist subjunctive is treated in section 116b. In
16:32 the I future in A parallels a conjunctive in BO in a
pattern analogous to that described in section 118. The
I future in A is anomalous, but connected to the preceding
II future by ⲁⲩⲱ, it is clearly coordinate.

185 In many instances A and BO agree in using the con-
ditional as a translation for the aorist subjunctive with
a ⲉⲁⲛ (8:36, 55; 11:40, 48, 57; 12:24, 32, 47; 15:7; 16:7;
bc 19:2 [completely restored in A]), with ⲕⲁⲛ (11:25), or
with ⲟⲧⲁⲛ (7:31; 8:28; 10:4; 13:19; 14:29; 15:26; 16:4, 21).
In two examples cited previously (sec. 29b) the positive
conditional of BO appears without -ϣⲁⲛ- (5:43; 6:51).
d Previous reference has also been made to the use in BO of
the negative conditional ⲁⲛⲛⲉ- opposite the usual negative
conditional of A (ⲉϥⲧⲙ-) as a translation of the aorist
e subjunctive (sec. 122b) and to the use in BO of the
relative future substantive opposite the conditional of A
(sec. 130a-c).

186a In two cases (8:51, 52) A and BO agree in using
the relative future substantive as a translation of the
b aorist subjunctive with ⲉⲁⲛ ⲧⲓ. The future circumstantial
(A) opposite the conditional (BO) occurs as a translation
of the aorist subjunctive with ⲟⲧⲁⲛ in 5:7.

187a Mention has been made above (sec. 122a) of the use
of ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ plus the conjunctive in A opposite the ⲁⲛⲛⲉ-
negative conditional in BO. This correspondence translates
b the aorist subjunctive in 6:44; 7:51; 15:4. In 11:52 A
and BO alike have the conjunctive as a translation of the
aorist subjunctive with ⲓⲛⲁ. The usage of A in this
instance is anomalous but conforms to the usual Bohairic
c usage. In 16:2 A employs an idiom which occurs occasionally
in BO (see sec. 119), the conjunctive without ϩⲓⲛⲁ to
translate an aorist subjunctive with ⲓⲛⲁ. BO uses the
form which one would normally expect in A, the III future
(without final -ⲉ- in the prefix).

188 In 19:24 A and BO agree in using the Coptic jussive for an aorist hortatory subjunctive.

189 The aorist subjunctive in 10:5 is part of a maxim-like saying which, as has been noted previously (sec. 56f), may be translated by either future or the tense of habitude. The use of habitude in A and BO is thus quite appropriate.

190a In 11:56 A and BO agree in using the present of ⲛⲛⲏⲩ to translate the aorist subjunctive. The present tense is not a common translation of the subjunctive, but ⲛⲛⲏⲩ as a present with futuristic sense parallels the more

normative practice which employs some form of Coptic future
b to translate the subjunctive. On the other hand, the
appearance of the present tense in BO as a translation for
the aorist subjunctive τηρησατε in 14:15 would seem to be
a variant. A has I future.

191 One other instance may be a variant. The tense
use in 13:38 between A and BO corresponds ("not yet" and
future), but while A translates the Greek literally, BO
reverses the phrases. There is, however, little sense
difference between "A cock will not crow before you deny
me three times" (A) and "Before a cock calls, you will
deny me three times" (BO).

192a The Greek relative with subjunctive used as the
object of the verb is translated by the relative future
b substantive in A and BO (14:13; 15:16; 16:23). One
instance (4:14) where a relative with aorist subjunctive
is used as the subject of the verb is translated also in
A by a relative future substantive. This example is
c lacking in BO. In 11:22 both ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ with relative future
(A) and the relative future substantive (BO) seem to be
satisfactory translations of οσα αν followed by the aorist
subjunctive.

193 The aorist subjunctive used with the interrogative τι, on the same pattern which appears with the indicative tenses, is translated in both A and BO by a non-verbal sentence with relative future predicate (12:27, 49).

194 Although the relative future substantive in 16:13 (BO) is an expected translation for the relative with aorist subjunctive used as the object of the verb, the relative perfect substantive used by A appears to be a variant.

195 The non-verbal with relative predicate used by both A and BO in 13:24 is the usual translation for the interrogative τις. Since the optative in the Greek here is the only occurrence in John, there is not sufficient evidence to determine what the normative means of expressing it might be. However, one suspects that, as with the subjunctive, some form of future would normally translate the optative. Consequently, one is inclined toward the view that the relative present used by BO (lacuna in A) does not translate the ειη of the TR.

Periphrastic Expressions with ειμι

196 There are enough examples of periphrastic combinations in John to require separate treatment for them. In one group there are expressions combining an inflected form of ειμι with the present or perfect participle. Coptic translates these expressions sometimes with a corresponding periphrastic expression, sometimes with a
a simple tense form. In 6:45 and 10:34 where the Greek has the present of ειμι plus the perfect passive participle, A and BO both use the simple I present qualitative. Curiously, in BO both of these impersonal expressions
b appear without a subject prefix pronoun. In two instances where the present of ειμι and the perfect passive participle are used with καθως (6:31; 12:14), predictably both A and BO translate the expression "according to the way" plus the relative present qualitative.

197a In one example (13:23) where the imperfect of ειμι appears with the present middle-passive participle, A and BO agree in the use of a periphrastic parallel--that is,
b the imperfect with following circumstantial. In 11:1, on the other hand, where the Greek imperfect with present

active participle is translated, BO has the corresponding periphrastic, but A has the simple imperfect.

198 The translation of the imperfect of ειμι with the
a perfect participle exhibits some variety. In four cases
where the perfect participle is used with ειμι in the
imperfect, A and BO agree in the use of the imperfect
qualitative (18:18, 25; 19:19, 20 [both restored in A]).
b A fifth instance in A (12:16) translating the same Greek
construction may also have had the imperfect qualitative
(entirely restored). In BO, however, this expression is
made emphatic by the use of a non-verbal sentence with
relative present (qualitative) predicate. The context
c gives the expression past sense. In both 18:18, 25 cited
above (in A and BO) two participles follow ην in the Greek.
While the first is rendered by the imperfect, the peri-
phrastic sense comes over in the translation of the second
as a circumstantial.

199 Two additional examples where the perfect participle
appears with the imperfect of ειμι depart from the fore-
a going patterns by translating with the Coptic perfect. In
19:11 the I perfect may be used in A and BO because of the
b third person indefinite passive. The second example
(3:21), available only in the text of A, may simply be a

variant. The phrase ινα φανερωθη αυτου τα εργα οτι εν θεω εστιν ειργασμενα is translated by ϫεκαϲε ερε [νεϥ]ϩθηυε ογω̣ν̣ϩ αβαλ ϫ[ε ν]τ̣αϥεετογ ϩ[νπ]ογαειν. The shift from "in God" to "in the light" is clearly a variant. The shift from passive to active may also be a variant.

200 In 13:5 the relative used with the imperfect of ειμι and the perfect passive is translated, not surprisingly, by a relative imperfect qualitative in BO. Although a portion of the text is lacking in A, this manuscript apparently translated the expression by a relative present, past by context.

201 Among the periphrastics with ειμι and the participle
a there are, finally, four examples in the subjunctive. In 6:65 the present subjunctive of ειμι with the perfect participle appears in a conditional clause introduced by εαν μη. In accordance with the patterns described for translating the subjunctive, A translates with ειμητι and the conjunctive; BO, with the αννε- negative conditional.

b In 16:24 and 17:19, 23 the present subjunctive of ειμι with the perfect participle is translated in BO by a corresponding periphrastic expression appropriate to the subjunctive used after ινα--that is, the conjunctive with following present circumstantial. A usual subjunctive parallel in A, the II future after ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ, is used by this manuscript in 16:24. In 17:19 the translation of A, using the II future with a present circumstantial, is periphrastic. The instance in 17:23 is a lacuna in A.

Constructions with δει, δυναμαι, and μελλω

202a It appears that although δει with the complementary
infinitive can be translated in A by either the impersonal
(3:7 [ⲫⲁⲛ]; 9:4 [ⲥϣϣⲉ]) with following infinitive or by
the I (3:14 [relative future]; 10:16; 12:34) or II (4:24)
future, in BO normally only some form of impersonal with
b following infinitive or conjunctive can be used. In 9:4
BO parallels A (ⲥϣϣⲉ) in using the impersonal ⲥⲏⲡ with
c following infinitive. The text of BO at 4:24 is fragmen-
tary, but apparently ⲥⲏⲡ with a following conjunctive was
d used. In three cases (10:16; 12:34; 20:9) BO translates
δει with infinitive by the expression ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ plus the
e conjunctive. In one instance (4:30) where the oblique
relative οπου precedes δει, A and BO apparently (the text
of BO is fragmentary) agree in the use of the expression
"the place which" followed by the relative with ⲥϣϣⲉ plus
the infinitive.

203a Mention may be made here of two additional impersonal forms. In 18:31 the Greek εξεστι is transliterated in A. In BO, however, the form ⲙⲡⲉⲥϣⲉ appears. Taken as a negative perfect this form does not fit its context in BO. Probably the scribe has erred in writing what he intended to be the negative habitude. There may have been additional confusion out of mental vacillation over the use of one or the other of the two equivalent words ϣϣⲉ
b and ⲙⲡϣⲁ. In 13:14 οφειλετε is apparently translated in A with ⲥϣⲉ (restored) and the infinitive; by BO, with the equivalent ⲥⲉⲡϣⲁ (ⲙⲡϣⲁ) and the conjunctive.

204 The Greek text of John exhibits over thirty uses of δυναμαι with the infinitive, and the translations of
a A and BO show several basic patterns. It may be noted initially that all except three occurrences appear in the Greek with the present of δυναμαι plus the present or aorist, and in one instance, the perfect infinitive. The tense of the infinitive shows no effect on the Coptic translation. However, only in the three cases where a past tense of δυναμαι is used does the Coptic use a past tense. Thus, in periphrastic expressions the tense distinctions made in the Coptic between present and past time probably derive from the underlying Greek although

the same statement probably cannot be safely made concerning
b distinctions in Coptic between perfect and imperfect. In
the apodosis of the contrary-to-fact clause in 9:33 the
imperfect future is used appropriately in both A and BO.
c In 11:37 context requires that the ⲙⲟⲛϣϫⲟⲙ of BO be trans-
lated with past sense. Although there is a brief lacuna
in A at this point, this manuscript probably had imperfect.
d In 12:39 both A and BO have past tense. Aside from the
possibility that differences in Coptic between the perfect
and imperfect in periphrastic constructions do not derive
from the underlying Greek, the ambiguity already noted
(sec. 66a) in connection with the quality of action
expressed by the word "believe" perhaps accounts in this
instance for the opposition between perfect (A) and
imperfect (BO).

205 In many cases the constructions used by A and BO
to translate δυναμαι with the infinitive are equivalent.
a The ⲙⲛϭⲁⲙ / ⲟⲩⲛϭⲁⲙ of A is equivalent to ⲙⲟⲛϣϫⲟⲙ / ⲟⲩⲟⲛϣϫⲟⲙ
in BO. This construction with following infinitive appears
as the translation of δυναμαι and the infinitive in 5:30;
8:43; 10:21; and 11:37 (see sec. 204c). In a portion of
the text contained only within A the same structure occurs
b four other times (3:2, 3, 4, 5). A similar form which

replaces the infinitive after ⲙⲛϭⲟⲙ with the conjunctive
c occurs two times in A and BO (6:65; 10:35). A slight
variation in which ⲟⲩⲛϭⲟⲙ / ⲙⲛϭⲟⲙ is followed in A by the
infinitive and in BO by the conjunctive occurs in 5:19;
d 6:44; 7:7; 9:16; 10:29; 12:39. This opposition occurs
e within a relative substantive in 14:17. A second general
construction used to translate δυναμαι and the infinitive
in both A and BO is the I future with -ϣ- and a complementary infinitive which follows directly without
intervening preposition (7:34, 36; 8:22 [BO text garbled];
13:33 [A lacuna]).

206 The two general constructions (see sec. 205a and e
above) which A and BO use in common are combined in a
a divergence between the two. In 13:36, 37; 15:5; 16:12,
A translates δυναμαι and the infinitive with the I future
plus -ϣ- and directly attached complementary infinitive,
b while BO uses ⲙⲟⲛϣϫⲟⲙ plus the infinitive. This opposition
substituting the II for the I future in A occurs in 5:44.
c In 6:52 A has the II future substituted for I future in
the construction and BO has the infinitive replaced by the
d conjunctive. This construction with BO using the infinitive
rather than the conjunctive appears with the relative in
e 15:4. The opposition precisely reverses itself in 8:21

where A has ⲙⲛϭⲁⲙ with the infinitive and BO has I future
f with -ϣ- and the infinitive. In almost all of the cases where some form of the future is used, δυναμαι admits of futuristic interpretation. An exception occurs in 15:4 where there is a maxim-like saying which the ⲙⲟⲛϣϫⲟⲙ of BO translates rather literally, but which the future, elsewhere used to render such maxims, translates equally
g well in A. In 16:12 the presence of αρτι in the context makes the future used by A awkward. If αρτι is omitted, one can readily see the possibility for interpreting the Greek present futuristically. Thus αρτι was probably missing from the exemplar of A.

207 In 9:4 the maxim-like character of the Greek οτε ουδεις δυναται seems to account both for the future used by A and the more literal impersonal of BO. The two texts treat οτε differently. A with the circumstantial future takes it as a temporal particle. BO, on the other hand, on the analogy of section 77a treats οτε as a relative by using a circumstantial relative.

208 The future is used in two other instances to
a translate futuristic δυναμαι and the infinitive. In 3:4, 9, where BO is lacking, A has the II future used alone. The Greek interrogative πως seems to influence the usage here.

b In 14:5, A uses the III (ⲉⲛⲁ perhaps II future) future
with -ϣ- and infinitive opposite the I future of BO. The
translation of A is literal, but the omission by BO of -ϣ-
c appears to be a variant. In 6:60, A and BO agree in the
use of a non-verbal sentence with a relative future
predicate used with -ϣ- (-ϣ- [A] equals ϣϫⲉⲙϫⲟⲙ [BO]) and
d the infinitive. The use by A in 9:33 of the imperfect
future plus -ϣ- and the directly connected infinitive is
paralleled in BO by the identical structure except that
-ϣ- is replaced by a Bohairic equivalent ϫⲉⲙϫⲟⲙ.

209 It may be well also to note that BO may use the impersonal to translate futuristic contexts other than those with δυναμαι. In 14:6 ⲙⲟⲛϣϫⲟⲙ and the conjunctive with ⲉⲓ appears opposite the futuristic ⲙⲛ . . . ⲛⲛⲏⲩ of A as the translation for ουδεις ερχεται.

210 The use in 15:24 by BO of a circumstantial relative with ⲙⲛϣϫⲟⲙ and the conjunctive is perhaps a legitimate interpretation of the Greek α ουδεις αλλος πεποιηκεν. A translates literally with a circumstantial relative negative perfect.

211 The translation of μελλω with the infinitive also exhibits a variety of possibilities. The tense of μελλω seems to have little influence on the translation. In

7:35 and 14:22 (here the II future appears in BO with the anomalous form ⲉⲕⲛⲁ) A and BO agree in translating the present of μελλω with the infinitive by the II future. On the other hand, A and BO agree in the use of II future to translate an instance in 18:32 where μελλω appears in the imperfect. In addition, A uses the II future for the imperfect of μελλω and the infinitive in 12:33. In all of these instances it is the present infinitive which appears with μελλω.

212 In the translation of BO opposite A in 12:33 ⲑⲱϣ appears in place of -ⲛⲁ- to signify the future sense of μελλω. The tense of ⲑⲱϣ is problematic. Except for the following complementary infinitive one might assume initial ⲁ with ⲑⲱϣ signifies a II future parallel to that of A. On the other hand, it might be a II present. As noted above (sec. 211), the tense of μελλω seems to have little bearing on the translation.

213 ⲑⲱϣ appears as the futuristic element of BO in
the translation of μελλω and the infinitive in several
a other cases. In 6:15 it appears with ⲉⲓ opposite the
b futuristic present ⲛⲛⲏⲩ in A. Although in 4:47 A and
BO agree in the use of imperfect future to translate
c μελλω plus the infinitive, again in 11:51 the imperfect

with θωϣ appears in BO opposite the imperfect future of A.

d Comparison of these last two examples with those cited above (sec. 211) involving the imperfect of μελλω suggests that perhaps the Coptic in translating this construction reserves the imperfect future for statements where the time of fulfillment is indefinite ("would"). The II future would then be used for statements where the point of outcome is more imminent ("about to").

214 In 6:71 BO translates the imperfect of μελλω and the infinitive by an emphatic non-verbal with relative imperfect followed by θωϣ. A uses the emphatic imperfect non-verbal with relative future predicate.

215 In 6:6 τι used as a relative with μελλω and the infinitive is translated typically by a non-verbal sentence with relative predicate. Opposite the relative future of A, however, BO in translating μελλω with the word ρωουϣ apparently mistakes μελλω for the word μελω. The relative future of A indicates the presence of μελλω in the underlying Greek, while the imperfect of BO takes note literally of the tense of μελλω but misses the word itself.

216a In 7:39 the imperfect of μελλω and the infinitive used with a relative is translated in A by relative future; in BO, by the relative imperfect future. When the -να- of

A is translated as μελλω rather than as a regular future, then the relative becomes past by context and is virtually
b equivalent to the relative imperfect future of BO. In 12:4 the participle of μελλω with the infinitive used as an oblique adjectival relative is translated in A with the demonstrative ⲡⲉⲉⲓ and the relative future plus infinitive, while in BO the relative substantive (here as elsewhere in BO ⲫⲏ with relative corresponds to Sahidic ⲡⲉⲧ-) with ⲑⲱϣ and the infinitive is used.

217 The use in 16:19 of the II future in A opposite ⲑⲱϣ plus the infinitive in BO to translate ηθελον plus the infinitive is anomalous and appears to reflect a variant.

Portions of the Text Found Only in F and in BO

218 Certain portions of the text which are present in F and BO but absent in A, the basic text for this investigation, can be compared only with the Greek. In F only verses 7:11-7:26 fit this category. The following verses found in BO are either lacking or extremely fragmentary in A: 7:11-7:28; 19:39-20:13; 20:27-21:25.

219 Oppositions between the Greek and the Coptic which have previously been clearly identified as equivalent will

be ignored here.[1] No oppositions outside this category are present in the small portion of F which is lacking in A. With the obvious equivalences between the Greek and BO eliminated, still a considerable number of instances need explanation.

220 To begin with, a couple of cases where the Greek

a present is translated by imperfect offer problems. In 7:22 perhaps the translator felt that the tense of the parenthetical phrase "not that it [circumcision] is from Moses," insofar as it referred to Moses, should be past.

b The present (TR)-imperfect (BO) opposition in 7:25 is also somewhat puzzling. Here the conative sense of the verb "seek" with complementary infinitive is clear. This sense, which can be expressed by the present, as here, is more frequently expressed by the imperfect.[1] Perhaps this fact lies behind the use in BO of the imperfect instead of the present. The translation of a Greek present by a Coptic imperfect is more difficult to reconcile than the reverse Greek imperfect translated by a Coptic present. These examples may simply represent a variant text.

---

[1] The following is a list of oppositions in construction and tense between the Greek and BO which fit this category: present / II present; historic present / perfect; futuristic present / future; aorist / perfect; aorist of λεγω / πεϫε″; perfect / perfect; aorist participle / finite perfect; aorist participle / past temporal; verbal participle / circumstantial; substantival participle / relative substantive; relative / relative (including circumstantial), relative substantive; finite verb / non-verbal with relative predicate; infinitive / conjunctive; subjunctive with ινα / conjunctive; subjunctive with εαν / conditional; subjunctive / III future. Likewise ignored is the Greek present participle translated in Coptic by a tense which corresponds to the tense of the Greek main verb.

221 While the tense of habitude most frequently translates the Greek present, there is no doubt about its appropriateness in 21:18 as a translation of the imperfect. In both cases the imperfect is best translated here by the phrase "used to."

222 There are three instances where the imperfect is
a translated by the perfect. In 7:15 the opposition may result from the particular verb which is at issue. εθαυμαζον (here followed by λεγοντες) may be related to the verbs of "saying." As such it would be subject to the ambiguity between imperfect and aorist described in
b section 27. The imperfect-perfect opposition in 20:3 is another matter. Used with the preposition εις the imperfect of the Greek indicating incomplete progress in the effort of the two disciples to reach the tomb is

---

[1] See Blass and Debrunner, p. 167.

necessary for the following context which shows the men still on the way. BO handles εις with a different preposition (ϣⲁ) which means "to" or "toward." Thus, the Coptic perfect used with ϣⲁ in the sense of "toward" gives essentially the same sense as the Greek of TR. An aorist with a preposition meaning "toward" would have been a successful alternative for the Greek. Such an aorist would only have declared the fact of a movement toward the tomb, with no implication regarding the conclusion of the movement.

223 In one instance (21:20) the previous opposition appears in reverse with the relative aorist of the Greek translated by Coptic relative imperfect. There seems to be no obvious explanation for such a change. In view of the fact that the text of BO omits the first of the two parallel phrases ("whom Jesus loved . . . who also reclined") the tense of the second phrase may represent a variant text. On the other hand, the translator may have regarded the word "recline" as involving continuous action (compare καθημαι, sec. 142c).

224 Two instances where the imperfect is used with temporal particles (ως and οτε) are appropriately translated in BO by circumstantial (20:11; 21:18).

225 Although the perfect is the usual translation for
the aorist, in four instances BO translates the aorist
with the imperfect perfect. In each of these cases the
context makes a pluperfect translation of the aorist
a appropriate. In 20:5 the aorist conveys the fact that the
"other disciple" had not gone into the tomb before Peter
arrived. Likewise, in 21:3 the implication is that when
morning came, the men had not caught any fish. Viewed
from the immediately following context, the preceding
action is past perfect, as far as English is concerned, in
b both of these examples. Relative to the preceding context,
the action in 21:17 and 21:23 is past perfect. Thus in
the first case, Peter was grieved that Jesus had said to
him a third time, "Do you love me?" In the second, with
regard to the previous question of the death of the beloved
disciple, Jesus had not said he would not die.

226 The appropriateness of translating the pluperfect of ιστημι with the imperfect as in 20:11 has already been noted (sec. 172c).

227 ηδεισαν has likewise been designated as imperfect
a in sense (sec. 26b).[1] Thus ουδεπω with the pluperfect

---

[1] The translation of ηδεισαν in 21:4 by the imperfect

ηδεισαν is suitably translated by the imperfect "not yet"
b tense (ⲚⲈⲘⲠⲀⲦ-) in 20:9. The occurrence in 19:41 of the relative with ουδεπω and the aorist passive is appropriately translated by a circumstantial relative with the "not yet" tense. In view of the Greek aorist used in this construction one might expect an imperfect ⲘⲠⲀⲦ-. It is a question, however, whether in addition to the usual conditional use of the circumstantial imperfect (ⲈⲚⲈ-) this structure may function as a circumstantial relative imperfect. In any event, the tense of unconverted ⲘⲠⲀⲦ must often be determined by context, as the simple form may translate present, aorist, or perfect.

228 The translation of BO in 21:22 of εως ερχομαι is noteworthy. The phrase is rendered by the expression ϣⲁϯⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲛⲓ. Apparently the Coptic is a periphrastic expression meaning "until I am about to" or "am going to come." A similar construction appears in verse 7:8 of A. The structure is closely equivalent to a future and, as ερχομαι could be interpreted as a futuristic present, probably represents no variant.

---

perfect must represent a slip on the part of the scribe. This is the only instance where ηδειν is translated "literally."

229a In 21:24 the translation of the present participle b by a relative perfect appears to reflect a variant. In the same verse the translation of γραψας ταυτα by a non-verbal with relative perfect predicate is somewhat unusual. This construction normally renders only finite forms. However, notice has been taken previously of the frequent practice in Coptic of treating aorist participles as if they were finite forms (compare sec. 101). Except for the substitution of "them" (-ⲟⲩ) for ταυτα no variant seems to be indicated.

230 The circumstantial frequently expresses a conditional clause. Consequently, if the translation of the participle πιστευοντες in 20:31 is taken with conditional sense, as it may be, then the use of the conditional rather than a circumstantial is an entirely appropriate interpretation.

231 In Greek the second of two imperatives connected by και may be interpreted with the connotation of purpose.[1] Thus the translation of such an imperative in 21:12 by the future conjunctive (ⲧⲁⲣⲉ-) is satisfactory. The same holds true for BO in 11:34 (lacuna in A). A similar example

---

[1] Blass and Debrunner, p. 227.

occurs in 7:52 where A and BO agree in following the first imperative with an infinitive connoting purpose.

232 There is no article with the substantive adjective in the expression τουτο ηδη τριτον εφανερωθη of 21:14. Consequently, it is legitimate to interpret the phrase as having predicative sense with a relative implied. This BO does by using a relative perfect for the Greek verb.

233 In 21:15 there is no variation in tense, and the use by BO of the expression "when they ceased eating" is probably a legitimate interpretation of οτε ουν ηριστησαν.[1] The same kind of situation occurs in 13:12 of A.

234 The use in 21:25 of the future with -ϣ- and complementary infinitive seems to be a legitimate interpretation of οιμαι with the aorist infinitive. The following present passive participle is contemporaneous with the previous construction and is thus suitably translated by a relative passive future.

---

[1] Cf. 6:66 in A: ⲁⲩⲗⲁ [ⲉⲩⲙⲁ]ⲁϩⲉ for ουκετι περιπατουν.

Other Constructions

235 As indicated at the outset of the investigation, the verb offers the most fruitful field for comparison between Greek and Coptic. The problems and complexities involved in comparing other constructions must at least be noted. Till states the problem with regard to three such constructions:

> If . . . in the Coptic version there is sometimes an equivalent for the Greek και, sometimes not, this is by no means always due to a variant but very often to the fact that in Coptic an expression meaning "and" (there are three) is used or not used according to principles entirely different than in Greek. The same holds good for the article and the possessive.[1]

We turn now to a brief assessment of the situation with regard to each of these three constructions: the connective, the article, and the possessive.

236a The opinion of Till regarding the difficulty of discerning underlying Greek on the basis of the Coptic translation of και is shared by Gehman (p. 326). Grossouw (p. 13), on the other hand, believes the view of Gehman that "the use of the word 'and' in Coptic does not have any textual significance" is exaggerated. As Grossouw (p. 13) sees it, whenever the translator adds "and" one may assume a Greek variant. On this latter point Grossouw is generally supported by the latest researcher on the subject, Rodolphe Kasser.[1] Kasser's findings probably represent the most comprehensive study of the subject to date. He has examined the Coptic practice not only with regard to και but also with δε, ουν, γαρ, and αλλα. Kasser's method has been to compare the translation of each particle in John in the Bohairic and Sahidic versions, BO, A, and F (the results of A and F are included with the Sahidic since he presumes both to be translations from the Sahidic version) with the Nestle Greek text. He notes the percentage of agreement with the Greek for each of the particles in each of the texts. He further cites the percentage of common agreement between various combinations of texts and the percentage of unique agreement and disagreement with the Greek by each of the texts. The high percentage of disagreement between the Greek and Coptic texts where the particles are at issue seems to preclude the possibility of assessing the underlying Greek except in a few instances. Based on the

---

[1] Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XL (1958), 238.

---

[1] L'Évangile selon saint Jean, pp. 62 ff. See also Ropes, p. 319.

percentage of agreement between the Greek and Coptic, Kasser concedes a high degree of probability for variation in the
c Greek text where A, BO, or F adds και. The same probability is present in support of the omission of γαρ in A and
d F and for the addition or omission of αλλα in A, BO, and F.

237 In view of the high degree of uncertainty involved in most cases of addition or omission of the various particles, the cases where one particle replaces another cannot be firmly established. A statistical study of these substitutions, such as has been done by Kasser,[1] does allow a high degree of probability to be attached to
a some transpositions of the particles. Thus the switch from Greek δε to ουν in A, F, and BO occurs, proportionally, in only a few cases. This switch may with considerable probability be charged to variant Greek rather than to Coptic idiom. On the other hand, the replacement of ουν by δε cannot reliably be charged to a variant Greek. In both S (Sahidic, including A and F) and BO the percentage of such changes is rather high (in S 17%, in BO 32%). A considerable number of these examples in BO may result

---

[1] The results of this study receive application in a collation of manuscripts presented in L'Évangile selon saint Jean, pp. 181 ff.

from the fact that σε, which in Sahidic and A generally corresponds to ουν, in BO frequently corresponds to δε.[1]

238 Among other replacements which on the basis of proportionally few changes probably represent variants are the switch from Greek ουν to και in F and A, the change from γαρ to και in BO, the substitution of δε for Greek γαρ in A, F, and BO, the switch from και to δε in A and F, and the reverse replacement in A and F of και by δε.[2]

239a When one examines the scholarly literature with regard to the use of the Coptic article as a vehicle for ascertaining the underlying Greek, one finds generally the view that the rules for determining use of the article in Greek and Coptic differ from one another so radically that nothing can be determined about the Greek text on the basis of the Coptic.[3] While the present investigator agrees with this view, he believes that it is possible on the basis of the practice of the two languages to see why, in many

---

[1] Crum, p. 802. Cf. Kasser, *L'Évangile selon saint Jean*, p. 63.

[2] See Kasser, *L'Évangile selon saint Jean*, pp. 62 ff. for a summary of the percentages involved in the various replacements.

[3] So Gehman, p. 296; Grossouw, p. 12. See also Ropes, pp. 319 f.

cases, the two disagree over use of the article. In both
languages the basic practice is the use of the article
with substantives. Differences occur between the two
languages over the rules for omitting the article. There
are several kinds of cases in Greek where the article may
be omitted, but where, on the contrary, Coptic does not
b omit the article. Thus, in Greek the article of a sub-
c stantive used with a preposition may be omitted.[1] Greek
d commonly uses abstract terms without the article.[2] On the
other hand, A, in such cases, generally uses the definite
e article, BO the indefinite.[3] In many instances where the
Greek has, in parallel to the Hebrew construct, an
anarthrous substantive governing a genitive, the Coptic
f appears with the article.[4] Again, while in Greek

---

[1] See Blass and Debrunner, pp. 133 f. Examples are εν σαββατω (5:16), εν συναγωγη (6:59), εν αμαρτιαις (9:34). In these examples A and BO agree in using the article.

[2] Ibid., pp. 134 f.

[3] For example, note the translation of the expression εχειν ζωην (5:24, 26, 40; 6:47, 54). The words εξουσια (5:27), κρισις (5:27; BO without article in 5:24), αληθεια (8:46), αμαρτια (16:8), δικαιοσυνη (16:8) receive similar treatment.

[4] See Blass and Debrunner, p. 135. Examples are found in 8:33; 9:28, 32; 17:24. In 9:5 and 12:31 BO, in contrast to A, uses the indefinite article. A appears with the indefinite article in 4:6.

substantivized adjectives may appear without the article
(for example, 9:30; 12:5),[1] Coptic, as in A, makes no such
g distinction, but rather uses the article. Finally, the
usual Greek procedure of using a predicate noun without
the article has no parallel in the Coptic practice (for
example, 5:9; 10:22).[2]

240 In some cases explanation for the Coptic addition of the article may be found in the Coptic rules for usage. The translation of the phrase "in Jerusalem," in Greek, usually without the article (compare sec. 239b; see, for example, 4:45; 5:1) is translated in A with the article according to a rule which states that the article is used before the names of some cities.[3] The ambiguity of the rule is illustrated by the fact that BO translates this construction without the article.

241 Although Chaine (pp. 121 ff.) provides a rather detailed set of rules to account for the use and omission of the Coptic article, it does not appear that there is yet an adequate understanding of the Coptic distinction

---

[1] Blass and Debrunner, p. 139.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 143.

[3] See Chaine, p. 122.

between the definite and indefinite articles. The rules of Chaine, which are perhaps the most detailed available, do not, for example, seem to account for the use of the indefinite article (A and BO) to translate τα βαια των φοινικων of 12:13. Nor does there appear to be any explanation for the use of the indefinite article in A (in contrast to BO) to translate της χωρας in 11:54 or the use of the indefinite article by BO (in contrast to A) in 6:17 to translate το πλοιον. To these may be added the numerous disagreements between A and BO in the use of the definite and indefinite articles cited in the preceding sections. These differences probably derive from differing interpretations of identical Greek text. The complexities are such that probably no reliable judgment about the original Greek can be made in these or in any but the most exceptional cases where the article is at issue.

242 Finally, there is the third group of cases mentioned by Till, the instances where Coptic uses a possessive pronoun. It is well known that Greek uses the article with a substantive to indicate a possessive pronoun where members of a family or parts of a body are concerned.[1]

---

[1] See Dana and Mantey, p. 148.

Where Coptic translates such cases with a possessive, it is impossible to determine whether the original Greek had an accompanying genitive pronoun or not. Moreover, Coptic does not appear to restrict the use of the possessive to cases where members of a family or parts of a body are involved. In A, for example, over against a Greek noun with article, the possessive is used with about twenty different words which fall outside the category of parts of the body or members of a family. With regard to the possessive, it seems safe to assume a variant only where the Greek article with substantive and genitive pronoun is translated without the possessive pronoun in Coptic.

243 One additional construction deserves mention. This is the Coptic practice with regard to the Greek emphatic subject pronoun. Since A reproduces these independent pronouns in all but a few cases, often even repeating the pronoun where its use is necessary in a non-verbal sentence, it appears that where A differs from the Greek a variant is involved. The same holds true for F. Compared to A and F, the practice of BO is erratic. This manuscript has nearly as many variations in the use of the emphatic subject pronoun in chapter eight alone as do A and F in all that portion of text which they reproduce.

It appears that with regard to the emphatic subject pronoun nothing can be determined about the usage of the underlying Greek on the basis of BO.

Conclusion

Over the lengthy course of this chapter we have examined many Greek and Coptic constructions. In some cases we have concluded that one or more of the Coptic texts reflects a Greek text which differs from the TR. These cases will appear as variants in the collation which is appended to the present study. In the great majority of cases, however, we have determined that apparent differences cannot reliably be charged to a differing Greek text. These cases, especially where the verb is involved, have provided insights necessary for recognizing the limits of the Coptic text for revealing the underlying Greek. Although in numerous instances the Coptic does appear to support one verb tense over another, there are clearly many situations involving differing Greek tenses in which the Coptic can bear no witness. Some of these arise from the fact that Coptic uses the same construction to translate more than one Greek construction. Thus, no choice can be made on the basis of the Coptic between the various "tenses" of the imperative, infinitive, and subjunctive in Greek. Moreover, except in Bohairic, Coptic consistently uses some form of future to translate both the Greek future and the subjunctive (except with conditional clauses). Because Coptic uses the I or II perfect to translate both the Greek aorist and perfect, no choice between variant readings involving these two Greek tenses can be made on the basis of the Coptic perfect. The same situation obtains in the case of the Greek present and perfect (unless the perfect is clearly aoristic in sense), since in addition to translating the present, the Coptic present tenses sometimes translate the Greek perfect. Since Coptic apparently often uses the II present to translate an imperfect with a closely connected adverbial element, it is sometimes not possible to determine whether the II present translates a present or an imperfect.

In some cases the similarity between Greek constructions prevents a choice between Greek alternatives on the basis of the Coptic. Where the Coptic has some form of future no choice can be made between a Greek future or subjunctive and a futuristic present. Similarly, where the Coptic has some form of perfect or the imperfect, no choice can be made between a historic present and an aorist or imperfect.

In still other cases the Coptic practice vacillates to such an extent that in these instances the Coptic can offer no hint of the underlying Greek. Thus, where verbs with stative qualities (for example, "believe") or verbs of "saying" or "asking" are at issue the Coptic practice varies too widely to support a choice between the Greek aorist and imperfect. For the same reason Coptic cannot usually support a choice between a finite tense and a verbal participle, between a periphrastic construction with ειμι and a simple tense form, or between a subjunctive purpose clause and a purposive infinitive.

Recognition of these general limits with regard to verbal construction,along with the limits described for comparison of the Greek and Coptic use of the article, the possessive, and the connectives, permits us to isolate a composite collation of Greek and Coptic readings which reflect the relation of the Coptic texts to the Greek with much greater accuracy than could otherwise be attained.

Chapter III

THE RELATIONSHIP OF A, BO, AND F TO THE EARLY GREEK MANUSCRIPTS

The starting point for the present investigation was the belief that a collation of the earliest Coptic manuscripts of the Gospel of John with the early Greek texts including the most recent acquisitions, P^{66} and P^{75}, might reveal new insights for a better understanding of the history of the primitive text of the New Testament. Using the insights gained from an extensive comparison of Greek and Coptic construction, the present investigator has compiled such a collation. Collations of A, BO, and F against the TR have been compared with a composite collation which reports all variations of P^{45}, P^{66}, P^{75}, ℵ, B, and W against the TR.[1] Furthermore, in order to check for possible "Western" influence, the Coptic texts have also been compared with a collation of Codex Bezae made against the TR.[1] The resulting composite collation of Greek and Coptic texts is therefore the basis for our conclusions about the textual relationship between the various manuscripts.

---

[1] See the Appendix of Porter, "A Textual Analysis of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the Gospel of John."

The Relative Relationship of the Coptic Texts to the Greek Texts

In a large number of instances the Coptic manuscripts are not supported by any of the Greek texts with which they have been compared. Within the portion of text reproduced by the respective Coptic manuscripts, 278 such cases have been tabulated in A; 380 in BO; and 26 in F. Among the variants represented by these figures some are significant; many are insignificant. Of the latter, a large number may not reflect a text differing from the TR. Although our examination of Greek and Coptic construction has illuminated many cases, there yet remain numerous situations where it is impossible to determine, without being arbitrary, whether variations in the Coptic texts stem from a differing Greek text, from Coptic idiom, or from the mind of the Coptic scribe. This difficulty, along with the fact that we frequently cannot distinguish between various Greek alternatives on the basis of the Coptic, makes it impossible to arrive at absolute percentages of agreement and disagreement between Greek and Coptic texts. However, when one compares a given Coptic text with several Greek texts and takes into account only those situations where the Coptic agrees with one of the Greek readings, it is possible to determine the relative agreement of the Coptic text with each individual Greek text.

---

[1] It should be noted that the text of Codex Bezae in John 18:13-20:13 is written by a different hand and in contrast to the rest of the Gospel presents a text closely akin to the TR. For this reason it has been omitted from our collation. In contrast, the text of W up to 5:12, although it is by a different hand, is quite similar to the rest of the Gospel. Consequently, it has been included in the collation.

The following tables present a picture of the overall affinity of the three Coptic texts with the Greek manuscripts with which they have been compared. Table I presents a tabulation of the total number of agreements and disagreements between each Coptic (A, BO, F) and each Greek text. Table II presents the same information, with the exception that the most obvious cases of scribal error in the Greek text have been excluded from the tabulation.[1] The percentages of disagreement presented in this table show the relative affinities of each Coptic text in turn for each Greek text.

---

[1] Only the most obvious errors have been omitted. Instances of possible homoioteleuton which are supported by more than one text have not been excluded.

Table I

	Textual Agreements with A	Variations from A
TR	519	215
p^{45}	33	19
p^{66}	443	172
p^{75}	347	97
ℵ	449	261
B	567	155
D	367	372
W	497	190

	Textual Agreements with BO	Variations from BO
TR	500	220
p^{45}	27	21
p^{66}	397	158
p^{75}	312	79
ℵ	466	249
B	567	147
D	363	289
W	427	152

	Textual Agreements with F	Variations from F
TR	55	36
p^{45}	2	4
p^{66}	53	28
p^{75}	58	20
ℵ	59	32
B	62	29
D	42	48
W	58	32

Table II

	Textual Agreements with A	Variations from A	Percentage of Variation from A
TR	452	215	32.2
P^{45}	31	18	36.7
P^{66}	399	157	28.2
P^{75}	314	87	21.7
ℵ	404	240	37.3
B	506	149	22.7
D	315	363	53.5
W	442	184	29.4

	Textual Agreements with BO	Variations from BO	Percentage of Variation from BO
TR	439	220	33.4
P^{45}	25	20	44.4
P^{66}	359	146	28.9
P^{75}	287	70	19.6
ℵ	423	232	35.4
B	512	141	21.5
D	314	279	47.0
W	378	146	27.8

	Textual Agreements with F	Variations from F	Percentage of Variation from F
TR	51	36	41.4
P^{45}	2	4	66.7
P^{66}	51	28	35.4
P^{75}	55	20	26.7
ℵ	57	30	34.5
B	58	29	33.3
D	39	47	54.6
W	55	31	36.0

The percentages of variation show that A is relatively nearest to P^{75}, with B only slightly less close. The much greater divergence from D indicates that although A--like all of the Greek texts under consideration--often supports Western readings, it is nevertheless distant from the chief Western representative because of its many departures from D. Much the same pattern appears with regard to the relation of BO to the Greek witnesses. BO is overall slightly closer to both P^{75} and B than is A, but from this general perspective the conclusion to be drawn is the same. Because of the relatively few cases involved in the comparison of F to the Greek texts, the comparative percentages of difference between F and the Greek are less reliable, although the statistics are consistent with the findings for A and BO. It is clear, at least, that F also is closest to P^{75} and B but most distant from D. The overall picture changes only slightly when the various Greek manuscripts are compared in pairs. When only the differences (excluding obvious scribal errors) between P^{66} and א are considered, A agrees with P^{66} 131 times; with א 94 times. BO agrees with P^{66} 109 times; with א 94 times. F agrees with P^{66} 17 times; with א 16 times. Both P^{66} and א have considerable numbers of unique variants, and so the number of disagreements between them is quite large. Although these figures show both A and BO closer to P^{66} than to א, they also show that BO is closer to א than is A.

A tabulation of the situations where P^{66} and P^{75} differ from each other shows that A agrees with P^{75} 53 times; with P^{66} 34 times. Among these instances P^{66} standing alone among the Greek witnesses is supported by A (along with F in two cases) in the following six cases.

3:20 τα εργα αυτου TR P^{75} ℵ B D W
τα εργα αυτου οτι πονηρα εστιν P^{66} A

6:42 ουν λεγει ουτος TR ℵ D
ουν λεγει P^{66} A F
νυν λεγει P^{75} B W BO

9:30 εν γαρ τουτω θαυμαστον εστιν TR P^{75} ℵ B D W
BO (ρω in place of γαρ)
τουτο γαρ το θαυμαστον εστιν P^{66} A
F (ρω in place of γαρ)

10: 6 τινα ην α ελαλει TR P^{75} ℵ B D W F
τι ελαλει P^{66} A

11:39 κυριε TR P^{75} ℵ B D W BO
omit P^{66} A

12: 8 γαρ TR P^{75} ℵ B D W
omit P^{66} A

In three instances P^{75} alone among the Greek texts is supported by A (along with BO in one case).

10: 2 εισερχομενος TR P^{66} ℵ B D W BO
ερχομενος P^{75} A

11:12 σωθησεται TR P^{66} ℵ B D W
εγερθησεται P^{75} A BO

12:34 τις εστιν ουτος ο υιος του ανθρωπου TR P^{66} ℵ
B D W BO
omit P^{75} A (possible homoioteleuton)

BO also favors P^{75} over P^{66} but, in comparison with A, by the reduced margin of 40 to 36 times. Moreover, BO agrees with P^{75} standing alone against the other Greek texts only in the case cited above (11:12). In contrast, BO supports P^{66} standing alone in the following four instances (along with F in one).

6:64 τινες εισιν οι μη πιστευοντες και TR P^{75}
ℵ (omits μη) B D W
omit P^{66} BO

7:37 εν δε τη εσχατη ημερα τη μεγαλη της εορτης
TR P^{75} ℵ B D A
εν δε τη εσχατη ημερα της εορτης W
εν δε τη εσχατη ημερα της μεγαλη εορτης
P^{66} BO F

9:39 τουτον TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A F
omit P^{66} BO

11:32 αυτω TR P^{75} ℵ B D W
omit P^{66} BO

Within the small portion of text which is preserved in F this manuscript supports P^{75} fourteen times; P^{66} seven times. Within these few instances, however, F supports six unique Greek readings. The readings where F supports P^{66} standing alone (6:42; 7:37; and 9:30) are cited above. F supports P^{66} standing alone in one other instance.

7:36 υμεις TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A
omit P^{66} F

P^{75} and F stand alone in the following two instances.

9:41 ουν TR
και P^{75} F
omit P^{66} ℵ B D W

10: 7 θυρα TR P^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
ποιμην P^{75} F

Principally on the basis of the reading in 10:7, Weigandt concludes that F is independent of the other Coptic translations and must have been translated directly from the Greek.[1] Since this reading does not appear in most of the Coptic manuscripts, it is difficult to explain it without recourse to the Greek. In view of the overwhelming verbal agreement between F and A (and the Sahidic manuscripts), however, the view that F is an independent translation from the Greek does not seem likely.

The evidence cited up to this point has supported the view that the three Coptic texts are closest to P^{75} and B among the Greek witnesses. What, if anything, can be determined about the degree of closeness of the Coptic texts to

---

1. Peter Weigandt, "Zum Text von Joh. X,7: ein Beitrag zum Problem der Koptischen Bibelübersetzung," Novum Testamentum, IX (1967), 45. This view, of course, contrasts with that of Husselman, pp. 17 f., and that of Kasser, Le Muséon, LXXIV (1961), 426.

Weigandt, p. 46, further suggests that the first translations of all the Coptic dialects were originally independent of each other rather than modifications of the two chief dialect versions.

one over against the other of these two Greek witnesses? Since P^{75} and B agree with each other more often than any other pair, there are relatively few cases to consider. Where the two disagree, A supports B twenty times; P^{75} seventeen times. Of the twenty agreements of A with B, P^{75} stands alone in seventeen. In only three of the seventeen cases where A agrees with P^{75} does B stand alone. In two of the seventeen cases where A agrees with P^{75} against B (10:2; 12:34 cited above), A only among the Greek and Coptic texts agrees with P^{75}. In one additional case A and BO alone agree with P^{75} (11:12 cited above). In only one case does A (along with BO) support B standing alone among the Greek witnesses.

7:47 αυτοις TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ D W
omit B A BO

BO agrees with B twenty times; with P^{75} fifteen times. BO has four agreements with P^{75} where B stands alone, and as with A, seventeen agreements with B where P^{75} stands alone. In one case (7:47 cited above) BO along with A agrees with B where B stands without other Greek support, and in one case (11:12 cited above) BO supports P^{75} standing alone among the Greek witnesses. In the six cases which appear in F, this manuscript supports P^{75} six times; B not at all. In two of these instances (9:41; 10:7 cited above) F is the only other support for P^{75}.

The fact that A and F support P^{75} standing alone among the Greek witnesses slightly more often than they do B standing alone is noteworthy, but it seems that no conclusive case for a greater affinity of A and F for P^{75} rather than for B can be made on the basis of this slim evidence. There remain sixteen cases where P^{75} and B disagree, each with the support of other Greek texts. Here too, the evidence is ambiguous. Although both A and BO favor P^{75} eleven times to three times for B, and F favors P^{75} three to zero, in thirteen of the sixteen cases ℵ also agrees with P^{75}, and W agrees with P^{75} in ten of the cases. Thus, since A and BO support ℵ as well as P^{75} against B in thirteen of the sixteen instances where P^{75} and B disagree, it is not possible to attribute conclusively the lack of support for B in these cases to P^{75}. The evidence would more convincingly favor P^{75} if, for example, P^{75} were supported in these cases by no other single witness more than five or six times. Yet in view of the fact that overall A and BO are much closer to B than to ℵ, it is significant that they favor ℵ strongly over B in precisely those instances where P^{75} agrees with ℵ.

Apparently, the only safe conclusions which can be drawn about the relative relationship of each of the Coptic texts to the individual Greek manuscripts are those which are based on the percentage of overall agreement and disagreement. From this general perspective perhaps the most useful finding is the discovery that A and BO (almost equally so) are nearest to P^{75} and B, and that a similar relationship holds true for F. Before we can draw final conclusions, however, attention must be given to the Coptic variants which are not supported by any of the Greek texts used in this investigation.

Coptic Readings Not Found in the Greek Texts

The fact that there are a considerable number of readings in the Coptic texts which find no support in the Greek texts which we have here collated has been stated above. We cite here a sampling of the most significant of such readings.

In omitting χθες in 4:52, A changes the chronology of the story, and thereby puts the meeting of the βασιλικος and his servants within a day's journey of Jesus' location. In 14:22 ιουδας ουχ ο ισκαριωτης appears in A as "Judas the Canaanite." An entirely different complexion is placed on Jesus' words in 17:12 when ουδεις . . . απωλετο appears in A as "none will perish." In 18:29 the accusation brought κατα του ανθρωπου τουτου appears in A as an accusation brought "into this place." A nuance differing considerably from the Greek is introduced into the dialogue in 18:37 when A translates Jesus' answer to Pilate, συ λεγεις οτι βασιλευς ειμι εγω, by the phrase "You say that you are a king." Lastly, in omitting γυναι in 19:26, A possibly intends to make Jesus' address to his mother appear less harsh.

The foregoing variants cited from A are not all unique in A, since several appear in the later Sahidic manuscripts. The following examples from BO, however, appear only in BO. (The reading of BO, translated into English, appears immediately below that of the TR.)

5:23 all occurrences of τιμαω
"love"

5:25 υιου του θεου
"son of man"

6:25 περαν της θαλασσης
"across the Jordan"

7:27 ποθεν εστιν
plus "or how he comes"

7:52 προφητης
"the Christ or the prophet"

8:34 πας ο ποιων την αμαρτιαν
"everyone who does not do the truth"

13:18 ινα η γραφη πληρωθη (Psalm 41:9)
"in order that the prophet might be fulfilled"

Undoubtedly, many of the more than six hundred variants (perhaps including some of those cited above) in A, BO, and F not found in the Greek texts did not derive from any Greek text. On the other hand, the reading of F in 10:7 ("the shepherd"), unknown to us in Greek texts until the discovery of P^{75}, indicates that many Coptic readings may derive from Greek texts which have not survived. The discovery of more, early Greek texts may reveal a Greek origin for other presently unique Coptic readings.

Conclusion

Although the overall percentages of disagreement cited above indicate an affinity on the part of all three Coptic manuscripts for the kind of text witnessed generally by P^{75} and B rather than that witnessed generally by P^{66} and ℵ, the slight degree with which A, BO, and F favor P^{75} over B is at most only a tentative clue which calls for further demonstration to justify firm conclusions. Consequently, the conclusions which the evidence allows us to draw about the history of the Greek text are modest. Although the evidence may not support an unequivocal conclusion about the history of the text, it may yet allow a tentative one. In the first place, although the difference in the overall percentage of disagreement shown by the Coptic texts between P^{75} and B is small, the percentages do show a slightly greater overall affinity by the Coptic texts for P^{75} than for B. Secondly, A and F show a slightly greater number of agreements with P^{75} standing alone among the Greek texts than they do with B standing alone (BO has the same number for both P^{75} and B). Finally, in sixteen instances where P^{75} and B disagree, each with the support of other Greek texts, A and BO each agree with P^{75} eleven times; with B three times. ℵ agrees with P^{75} in thirteen of the sixteen instances, but in view of the overall preference of A and BO for B rather than ℵ, the fact that the two Coptic texts strongly support ℵ against B in those cases where P^{75} agrees with ℵ, suggests that here too there is a tendency on the part of A and BO to support P^{75} over B. On the basis of these observations one may tentatively place the Greek texts underlying the Coptic chronologically and textually between P^{75} and B. Such a placing would support the view that sees a line of Greek transmission going back from Codex Vaticanus to the second century rather than the view that sees Codex Vaticanus merely as a fourth-century product of a conscious textual revision.

The evidence also allows a tentative conclusion about the history of the Coptic text. In view of the nearly equal degree of overall support shown by A and BO for P^{75} and B, it seems likely that in spite of broad differences A and BO have a common ancestry. If, as we have suggested, both texts ultimately derive from a Greek tradition which chronologically and textually lies between P^{75} and B, the preliminary view of Kasser that BO may derive from a "modèle sahidique ... plus archaique que celui qui nous est actuellement connu"[1] may be near the truth.

If, then, our three Coptic manuscripts most closely support the texts which are regarded by textual critics as the most reliable available, greater weight should be given to the witness of these three manuscripts as well as to other Coptic witnesses of later date which tend to agree with them. Although unique Coptic variants cannot well gain assent without Greek support, it must still be recognized that many such readings probably derive from early Greek manuscripts which have not survived. This view coincides with the evidence provided especially by P^{45}, P^{66}, and ℵ that the early Greek texts in Egypt varied widely from one another. Future consideration on the basis of internal evidence in early Coptic texts of other New Testament books for which no such manuscript as P^{75} exists to complement B could materially aid our efforts to achieve the best text possible.

---

[1] Papyrus Bodmer III, pp. X f.

APPENDIXES

Appendix I

THE COMPOSITE COLLATION

The composite collation lists variations from the textus receptus of our three Coptic texts (A, BO, F) and the following Greek manuscripts: Sinaiticus (ℵ), Vaticanus (B), Beza (D), Washingtonianus (W), Papyrus 45 (P^{45}), Papyrus 66 (P^{66}), Papyrus 75 (P^{75}). If a manuscript (Greek or Coptic) is not cited for a given reading, it is either lacking at this point, or, because of the peculiarities of Coptic idiom, can bear no witness. Where differences of vocabulary are cited, the work is heavily indebted to Kasser's vocabulary studies in L'Évangile selon saint Jean et les versions coptes de la Bible. In the same work the collation of numerous Coptic manuscripts exhibited by Kasser against the Nestle text has not proved so useful, mainly because it generally disregards variations in verb tense.

When the symbol for a Greek manuscript is given after a Greek reading, it cannot be assumed that the manuscript agrees with that reading in every detail. The chief concern has been to show basic agreement and disagreement between the Coptic texts in comparison with the Greek texts. Therefore, differences in the Greek which cannot be distinguished on the basis of Coptic idiom have been disregarded. Consequently, Greek manuscripts which are listed together in support of a given reading may differ individually in various ways--for example, orthographically, in tense usage, in the addition or omission of certain connective particles.

Where all the Greek texts stand united in opposition to one or more of the Coptic texts, only the TR among the differing Greek texts is cited. If in such cases the Coptic manuscripts stand united over against a divided Greek witness, all of the manuscripts (Greek and Coptic) are cited. Where Coptic readings find no support among the Greek witnesses, they are cited in Coptic except in a few instances where the Greek translation of the Coptic is self-evident.

The Coptic readings marked by an asterisk (*) differ in some manner from the TR, but do not, in the opinion of this researcher, stem from a differing Greek text. Our discussion of many of these cases can be found by consulting the index to Chapter II for the appropriate paragraph which deals with the given verse.

In instances where, because of mutilated text, the reading of a manuscript is probable but not certain, the symbol of that manuscript is enclosed in parentheses. Only those lacunae in the Coptic texts which involve the loss of at least a line have been noted.

2:12 ιης και η μητηρ αυτου

ου πολλας ημερας TR
ϩⲉⲛϩⲟⲟⲩ ϣⲏⲙ A

και οι μαθηται αυτου TR P66 P75 B W
omit ℵ A

εκει TR P66 P75 ℵ B A
omit W

2:13 και (1) TR P75 B W
δε ℵ A

2:14 κερματιστας TR P66 P75 ℵ B W
ⲙⲁⲥⲧ[ⲓⲅⲝ] A

2:17 κατεφαγε TR
καταφαγεται P66 P75 ℵ B W A

2:19 και (2) TR
ⲕⲁⲓ ⲉ[ϫⲱ] A

2:20 συ TR P75 ℵ B W A
omit P66

2:21 εκεινος TR P66 P75 ℵ B
αυτος W A

2:22 οι μαθηται αυτου TR P66 P75 ℵ B A
αυτω W

αυτοις TR
omit P66 P75 ℵ B W A

2:23 εν τω πασχα εν τη εορτη TR
ϩⲙ ⲡ[ϣ]ⲁⲉⲓⲉ ⲙⲡⲡⲁⲥⲭ[ⲁ] A

αυτου τα σημεια TR
ⲛⲙⲁⲉⲓⲛ A

2:24 παντας TR
ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ A

2:25 οτι TR
omit A

τι ην εν TR P66 P75 B W A
τι ην εν τι ην εν ℵ

3:2 τον ιησουν TR

αυτον p66 p75 ℵ B W A

3:2 εληλυθας διδασκαλος TR
* ⲚⲦⲔⲞⲨⲤⲀϨ ⲈⲀϤⲒ A

γαρ TR p66 p75 B W A
και ℵ

3:3 και ειπεν αυτω TR p66 p75 B W A
omit ℵ

σοι TR p75 ℵ B W A
υμιν σοι p66

γεννηθη TR p66 ℵ B W A
γεννηθην p75

ανωθεν TR
* ⲚⲔⲈⲤⲀⲠ A

3:5 εισελθειν TR p66 p75 B W A
ειδιν ℵ

του θεου TR p66 p75 B W A
των ουρανων ℵ

3:7 ανωθεν TR
* ⲚⲔⲈⲤⲀⲠ A

3:8 ερχεται TR
ⲚⲦⲀϤⲒ A

3:10 αυτω TR
omit A

3:14 ο ων εν τω ουρανω TR
omit p66 p75 ℵ B W A

μωσης TR
μωυσης p66 p75 ℵ B W A

3:15 μη αποληται αλλ TR
omit p66 p75 ℵ B W A

3:16 εδωκεν TR p66 p75 B W A
omit ℵ

3:17 ινα κρινη τον κοσμον TR p75 ℵ B D W A
omit p66

3:20 και ουκ ερχεται προς το φως TR p66 p75 B D W A

omit ℵ

τα εργα αυτου TR P^{75} ℵ B D W
τα εργα αυτου οτι πονηρα εστιν P^{66} A

3:21 εν θεω εστιν ειργασμενα TR
[ⲛ]ⲧ̣ⲁϥⲉⲉⲧⲟⲩ ϩ[ⲛ ⲡ]ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ A

3:21 expl. ειργασμενα, inc. 4:5 τω υιω αυτου A

4:6 εκ της οδοιπορια TR
* ⲉϥⲙ̣ⲁ[ⲁ]ϩⲉ A

ουτως TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W
omit A

πηγη TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A
γη P^{66}

4:9 ουσης TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A
omit D

ου γαρ συγχρωνται ιουδαιοι σαμαρειταις TR P^{66} P^{75} B W A
Omit ℵ D

4:10 σοι (1) TR
omit A

σοι (2) TR
omit A

4:11 αυτω TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A
αυτη P^{66}

η γυνη TR P^{66} D W
εκεινη ℵ
omit P^{75} B A

4:12 το φρεαρ TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D A
το φρεαρ το ζων W

4:13 inc. ο ιησους (1:1 - 4:12 a few very scattered fragments) BO

διψησει παλιν TR
omit BO (apparently - text mutilated)

4:14 ος δ αν πιη εκ του υδατος TR
omit BO (apparently - text mutilated)

αλλα TR P^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
ạλλο P^{75}

ο δωσω αυτω TR P^{66} P^{75} B A
ο εγω δωσω ℵ
ο εγω δωσω αυτω D W

4:15 expl. | κυριε, inc. 4:20 δει BO

4:16 ο ιησους TR ℵ D W
omit P^{66} P^{75} B A

4:17 ειπεν TR D W A
ειπεν αυτω P^{66} P^{75} B
omit ℵ

εχω (2) TR P^{66} P^{75} B W A
εχις ℵ D

4:19 κυριε TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A
omit ℵ

συ TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A
omit D

4:20 ο τοπος TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A
omit ℵ

4:22 ημεις προσκυνουμεν ο οιδαμεν TR
omit BO

εστιν TR
ΝΗΟγ BO

4:23 νυν εστιν TR BO
* ΕΤΕΤΕΕΙΤΕ A

αυτον TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D A
αυτον εν πνευματι W

4:24 ο θεος TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D A BO
ος W

αυτον TR P^{66} P^{75} B W A BO
omit ℵ D

4:25 οιδα TR
οιδαμεν A

4:27 και (1) TR BO
δε A

επι τουτω TR BO
* ΝΤΟγΝΟγ A

εθαυμαζον TR
* ⲁⲩⲙⲁⲉⲩ[ⲍⲉ] A

μεντοι TR A
omit BO

ειπε TR P^{66} P^{75} B W A
ειπεν αυτω ℵ D

4:29 μοι TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D A
omit W

4:30 και ηρχοντο TR
ⲁⲩⲛⲏⲟⲩ BO
omit A

4:31 δε TR P^{75} A BO
και W

εν τω μεταξυ TR
* ⲛⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ... ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲉⲩ A

ηρωτων TR BO
* ⲁⲥⲉⲡⲥⲱⲡ A

4:32 αυτοις TR A
omit BO

4:35 ετι TR P^{66} ℵ B W BO
omit P^{75} D A

4:36 χαιρη TR P^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
χαιρων P^{75}

4:37 εν ... θεριζων TR P^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{75}

4:38 ο TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B A
omit D W

4:39 εις αυτον TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

εποιησα TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{66}

4:40 ηρωτων TR
* ⲁⲩⲥⲉⲡⲥⲱⲡ" A

και εμεινεν εκει TR
omit A BO

4:41 επιστευσαν TR BO
επιστευσαν αυτον A

τον λογον αυτου TR
τον λογον A

4:42 ελεγον TR p^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
ειπαν ελεγον p^{75}

οτι (1) TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ D A BO
omit B W

την σην λαλιαν TR p^{66} p^{75} B W
την σην μαρτυριαν ℵ D
την λαλιαν A
τας λαλιας BO

ακηκοαμεν TR p^{66} p^{75} B W
ακηκοαμεν παρ αυτου ℵ D A BO

ουτος εστιν αληθως TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A BO
ουτος εστιν W

ο χριστος TR
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

4:43 και απηλθεν TR
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

4:44 ιησους TR A
omit BO

4:45 εδεξαντο αυτον οι γαλιλαιοι TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

παντα εωρακοτες α εποιησεν TR
ϫⲉⲛⲉⲁⲩⲛⲁⲩ [ⲉⲛⲓϩⲃⲏⲟⲩⲓ ⲧⲏ]ⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲁϥⲁⲓⲧⲟⲩ BO

αυτοι TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A
omit W

γαρ TR A
ϫⲉ BO

ηλθον TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A
εληλυθισαν ℵ BO

4:46 ο ιησους TR
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

και TR p^{66} p^{75} B W A

δε ℵ D

4:47 ουτος TR P66 P75 B D W A BO
omit ℵ

προς αυτον TR P66 ℵ B D W A BO
omit P75

ηρωτα αυτον TR BO
ⲁⲩⲥⲉⲡⲥⲱⲡϥ A
ηρωτα P66 P75 ℵ B D W

4:49 κυριε TR
omit A

4:50 ω ειπεν αυτω ο ιησους TR P66 B D W A BO
ον ειπεν ο ιησους P75
του ιησου ℵ

4:51 ηδη TR
omit A

και απηγγειλαν TR P66 ℵ D W A
omit P75 B BO

λεγοντες TR P66 P75 B W A BO
omit ℵ D

σου TR P66 D A BO
αυτου P75 ℵ B D W

4:52 επυθετο TR A
* ⲛⲁⲩϣⲓⲛⲓ BO

παρ αυτων την ωραν TR P66 ℵ D W BO
την ωραν εκεινην P75 B
την ωραν A

αυτω TR P66 P75 ℵ B D BO
omit W A

χθες TR BO
omit A

αυτον TR P66 P75 ℵ D W A
αυτην B

4:53 ο πατηρ TR P75 ℵ B D W A
ο πατηρ αυτου P66

ο ιησους TR P66 P75 B D W A BO

omit ℵ

5:2 βηθεσδα TR D
βηθζαθα ℵ
βηδσαιδα P^{66} P^{75} B W A BO

πεντε στοας εχουσα TR
* ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲉ ⲛⲥⲧⲟⲁ ϩⲓϫⲱⲥ A
* ⲉⲟⲩ[ⲟⲛ ⲛⲉ̄ ⲛ]ⲥⲧⲟⲁ ⲛϧⲏⲧⲥ BO

5:3 πολυ TR
omit P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

τυφλων χωλων TR A
χωλων τυφλων BO

ξηρων TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
ξηρων παραλυτικων D

εκδεχομενων την του υδατος κινησιν TR D W
omit P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B A BO

5:4 αγγελος ... νοσηματι TR
omit P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

5:5 εκει TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

ετη TR P^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{75}

εχων TR
* ⲁϥⲣ' A
* ⲉⲁϥⲉⲣ' BO

5:6 πολυν ηδη χρονον εχει TR P^{75} B D W
πολυν εχει χρονον P^{66} ℵ
ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲓⲣⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲓϣϯ ⲛⲭⲣⲟⲛⲟⲥ ϧⲉⲛ[ⲡⲉ]ϥϣⲱⲛⲓ BO
ⲁϥⲱⲥⲕ A

5:7 απεκριθη TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
λεγει D

αλλος προ εμου καταβαινει TR
* ϣⲁⲣⲉⲕⲉⲟⲩⲉⲉ ⲣϣⲁⲣⲡ ⲁⲣⲁⲉⲓ ⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲁϩⲣⲏï A
ϣⲁⲣⲉⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲉⲣϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲉ̣ϧ̣ⲣ̣ⲏ̣ⲓ̣ BO

5:9 και (1) TR
δε A
ⲧ̣ⲟ̣ⲧ̣ⲉ̣ BO

ευθεως TR P66 P75 B A BO
omit א D W

και ηρε TR P66 P75 B W BO
και ηγερθη και ηρε א D A

και περιεπατει TR BO
omit A

εν εκεινη τη ημερα TR P66 P75 א B W BO
omit D A

5:10 τω τεθεραπευμενω TR BO
omit A

ουκ εξεστι TR D
και ουκ εξεστι P66 P75 א B W BO

5:11 απεκριθη αυτοις TR D
ο ... απεκριθη αυτοις P66 P75 א B W A
ⲛⲑⲟϥ ... ⲁ[ϥⲉⲣ]ⲟⲩⲱ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ BO

εκεινος TR
* omit A

5:12 omit entire verse W

ηρωτησαν TR A
* ⲛⲁⲩϣⲓⲛⲓ ⲛ̣ⲥ̣ⲱ̣" BO

αυτον TR P66 א B D A BO
omit P75

ο ειπων σοι TR (A) BO
ⲉⲧⲁϥⲧ̣ⲣ̣ⲉ̣ⲕ̣ⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ alternate reading in BO

τον κραββατον σου TR D BO
omit P66 P75 א B A

5:13 ο ... ιαθεις TR P66 P75 א B W BO
ο ασθενων D
* ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲧⲁⲗⲥⲁϥ sic A

γαρ TR P66 א B D W A BO
δε P75

εν τω τοπω TR P66 P75 B D W
εν τω μεσω א
ϩⲛⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲉⲩ A BO

5:14 αυτον ο ιησους TR P66 P75 B D W A BO

ο ιησους τον τεθεραπευμενον ℵ

μηκετι αμαρτανε TR BO
* ⲙⲡⲣⲕⲁⲧⲕ̣ⲁⲣⲛⲁⲃⲉ A

5:15 ανηγγειλε TR P66 P75 B D W A BO
ειπεν ℵ

ιουδαιοις TR P66 P75 ℵ B D A BO
ιουδαιοις και ειπεν αυτοις W

αυτον TR P66 P75 ℵ B W A BO
με D

5:16 και εζητουν αυτον αποκτειναι TR
omit P66 P75 ℵ B D W A BO

εποιει TR P66 ℵ B D W A BO
εποιησεν P75

5:17 ο δε ιησους απεκρινατο TR P66 D A
ο δε απεκρινατο P75 ℵ B W
ⲛⲑⲟϥ [ⲇ]ⲉ ⲁϥⲉⲣ̣ⲟ̣[ⲩ]ⲱ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ BO

5:18 μαλλον TR BO
omit A

εζητουν TR
* ⲥⲉϣⲓⲛⲉ A

ελυε TR BO
* ⲉϥⲃⲱⲗ A

πατερα ιδιον ελεγε τον θεον TR
* ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲁⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ A
ⲉ̣ϥ̣ⲉ̣ⲣⲡ̣ⲕ̣ⲉ̣ ϫⲱ ⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲫϯ ϫⲉ ⲡⲁⲓⲱⲧ BO

ισον εαυτον ποιων τω θεω TR BO
omit A

5:19 απεκρινατο TR P66 P75 B D W A BO
omit ℵ

ο ιησους TR P66 ℵ D W A BO
omit P75 B

αμην αμην TR P66 P75 B D W A BO
αμην ℵ

υιος (1) TR P66 P75 ℵ B W A BO
υιος του ανθρωπου D

ποιουντα TR A
omit BO

5:20 εργα TR
omit BO

5:21 ζωοποιει (2) TR A
ϣⲁϥⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲟϩⲉ ϣⲁϥⲧⲁⲛϧⲱⲟⲩ BO

5:23 τιμωσι (1) TR A
ⲛⲧⲉ... ⲉⲣⲁⲅⲁⲡⲁⲛ BO

τιμωσι (2) TR A
ⲟⲩⲓⲣⲓ BO

μη TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{66}

ο... τιμων TR A
ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̣ⲉ̣ϥⲉⲣⲁⲅⲁⲡⲁⲛ BO

τιμα TR A
ϥⲓⲣⲓ BO

5:25 ωρα TR P^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{75}

και νυν εστιν TR P^{66} P^{75} B W BO
* ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ A
omit ℵ

θεου TR A
ⲙⲫⲣ̣[ⲱⲙⲓ] BO

5:26 γαρ TR
omit A

ο πατηρ εχει ζωην εν εαυτω TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A
* ⲟⲩⲟⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ϣⲟⲡ ϧⲉⲛ ⲫⲓⲱⲧ BO
ο πατηρ ο ζων εχει ζωην εν εαυτω D

ουτως εδωκε και τω υιω ζωην εχειν εν εαυτω TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A
omit ℵ
ⲡⲁⲓⲣⲏϯ ⲟⲛ ⲁϥⲭⲱ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛϧ ϧⲉⲛⲡⲓϣⲏⲣⲓ BO

5:27 και εξουσιαν εδωκεν αυτω και κρισιν ποιειν TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
και κρισιν εδωκεν αυτω εξουσιαν ποιειν ℵ

5:28 τουτο TR BO
omit A

εν τοις μνημειοις TR A
* ⲭⲏ ϧⲉⲛⲛⲓⲙϩⲁⲩ BO

5:29 οι... ποιησαντες TR A
ⲛⲓⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲉⲧⲣ̣ⲓ̇ BO

πραξαντες TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A
πρασσοντες D BO

5:30 κρινω TR A
ⲡⲁⲓⲣⲏϯ ϯϩⲁⲡ BO

ζητω TR BO
* ⲉⲓⲁϣⲓⲛⲉ sic A

αλλα TR p^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
αλλο p^{75}

πατρος TR
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

5:32 οιδα TR p^{66} p^{75} B W A (BO)
οιδαται ℵ D

5:33 μεμαρτυρηκε TR A
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲙⲉⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲱⲧⲉⲛ BO

5:34 λεγω TR A
ϯϫⲱ... ⲛⲱⲧⲉⲛ BO

5:36 α (1) TR ℵ B D W A BO
omit p^{66}

αυτα τα εργα α εγω ποιω TR A
omit BO

αυτα (2) TR ℵ B D W A
ταυτα p^{66}

εγω (2) TR D
omit p^{66} (p^{75}) ℵ B W A

5:38 και τον λογον αυτου ουκ εχετε μενοντα TR A
[ⲟⲩ]ⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲥⲁϫⲓ ϣⲟⲡ... ⲁⲛ BO

πιστευετε TR A
ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲁϩϯ BO

5:39 οτι... δοκειτε TR A
ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̣ⲙ̇ⲉⲩ̣ⲓ̇ BO

ζωην αιωνιον εχειν TR
* ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲏⲧⲛ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ϣⲁ ⲁⲛⲏϩⲉ A
* ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲟⲩⲱⲛϧ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲉϩ . BO

εκειναι TR P66 P75 ℵ B D A
αυται W
ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲑⲱⲟⲩ BO

5:40 ζωην TR P66 P75 ℵ B W A BO
ζωην αιωνιον D

εχητε TR BO
* ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁϫⲓ A

5:41 ου λαμβανω TR A
ⲙⲡⲓϭⲓ' BO

5:42 αλλ εγνωκα TR A
αλλα ϥϣⲟⲡ ⲛϫⲉⲡⲁⲓⲱⲧ ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧϯⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲏⲓ ⲁⲓⲥⲟⲩⲉⲛ' BO

την αγαπην του θεου ουκ εχετε εν εαυτοις TR P66 P75 B D W A
* ⲛⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲙⲫϯ ϣⲟⲡ ϧⲉⲛⲑⲏⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ BO
ουκ εχετε την αγαπην του θεου ουκ εχετε εν εαυτοις ℵ

5:43 ου λαμβανετε με TR
ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛϫⲓⲧ A

εαν αλλος ελθη TR A
* ⲁⲣⲉⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲉⲓ BO

5:44 θεου TR ℵ D
omit P66 P75 B W A BO

5:45 μωσης TR
μωυσης P66 P75 ℵ B D W A (BO)

5:46 ει επιστευετε TR (BO)
* ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛⲣⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ A

μωση TR ℵ
μωυσει P66 P75 B D W BO

επιστευετε αν (2) TR A
* ⲛⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲁⲛⲁϩϯ ... ϩⲱ BO

6:1 γαλιλαιας TR P66 (P75) ℵ B W A BO
γαλιλαιας εις τα μερη D

6:2 αυτου TR
omit P66 ℵ B D W A BO

6:3 δε TR P^{66} B
και ℵ
ουν D W A

εκει TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W BO
omit ℵ
ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲉⲧϥ A

εκαθητο TR
* ⲁϥϩⲙⲉⲥⲧ A BO

6:4 ην ... εγγυς TR A
* ⲛⲉⲁϥϧⲱⲛⲧⲡⲉ BO

6:5 πολυς TR BO
omit A

οτι ... ερχεται TR A
* ⲉϥ[ⲛ]ⲏⲟⲩ BO

αγορασομεν TR A
ⲁⲛⲛⲁϫⲉⲙ' BO

6:6 δε TR P^{66} B D W A BO
γαρ ℵ

ελεγε TR
* ⲛⲧⲁϥϫⲉ' A
* ⲉϥϫⲱ BO

γαρ TR P^{66} B D W A
δε ℵ

εμελλε ποιειν TR A
ⲛⲁϥⲣⲱⲟⲩϣ ⲉⲁⲓϥ BO

6:7 αυτω TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W BO
omit ℵ A

δηναριων TR
* ⲥⲧⲁⲧⲉⲉⲣⲉ A BO

αυτοις TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A
omit ℵ

βραχυ TR A
ⲗⲁⲕⲙⲓ BO

τι TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

εις τοσουτους TR
* ⲙⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲏⲏϣⲉ A BO

6:10 ειπε TR BO
ⲡⲁϫⲉ'... ⲛⲉⲩ A

χορτος πολυς TR p^{66} (p^{75}) B D W A
τοπος πολυς ℵ
ϩⲁⲛⲥⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲟϣ BO

τω τοπω TR
ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲉⲩ A BO

των αριθμον ωσει TR
* ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲣ' A
ⲧⲟⲩⲏⲙⲓ BO

6:11 δε TR ℵ
ουν p^{66} B D W A

αρτους TR p^{66} ℵ B W A BO
πεντε αρτους D

τοις μαθηταις οι δε μαθηται TR D A
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W BO

ομοιως και εκ των οψαριων οσον ηθελον TR BO
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥϫⲓⲧϥ ⲁⲣⲁⲩ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲛⲛⲧⲃⲧ A

inc. εκ F

6:12 περισσευσαντα TR ℵ D W A BO
περισσευοντα B

αποληται TR p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
αποληται εξ αυτων D F

6:13 συνηγαγον ουν TR A
ⲁⲩⲑⲱⲟⲩϯ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲉⲣϩⲟⲩⲟ BO

εγεμισαν TR A BO
* ⲁⲩⲙⲉϩ F

6:14 expl. ιδοντες, 6:16 inc. οι μαθηται αυτου F

ο ιησους TR
omit p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

αληθως TR p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

6:15 ινα ποιησωσιν TR A
* ⲛⲥⲉⲁⲓ" BO

παλιν TR P^{75} ℵ B D A
omit W BO

αυτος TR BO
omit A

μονος TR P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
μονος κακει προσηυχετο D

6:16 οι μαθηται αυτου TR P^{75} ℵ B D A BO F
omit W

6:17 ηρχοντο TR P^{75} B D W F
ερχονται ℵ
[ⲁⲧⲣ]ⲟⲩⲉⲓ A

ηδη TR P^{75} B W BO
omit ℵ D A

ουκ εληλυθει TR
* ⲉⲙⲡⲉ ... [ⲉⲓ] A
ουπω εληλυθει ℵ B D W BO
ηδη [ουπ]ω εγεγονει P^{75}

6:18 ανεμου μεγαλου πνεοντες TR A F
ⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩϫⲓⲛⲛⲓϥⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲛⲓϣϯ ⲛⲑⲏⲟⲩ BO

διηγειρετο TR A F
* ⲛⲉⲁ ... ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡϣⲱⲡⲓⲡⲉ BO

6:19 expl. ιησουν, 6:22 inc. περαν F

6:20 δε TR B D W A
και ℵ

6:21 λαβειν TR BO
* ⲁⲧⲉⲗⲁ" A

αυτον TR A
-ϥ ⲉⲣⲱⲟⲩ BO

υπηγον TR P^{75} B D W A BO
υπηντησεν ℵ

6:22 αλλο TR A BO
omit F

ουκ ην TR

* ⲙⲛ- A BO

εκεινο εις ο ενεβησαν οι μαθηται αυτου TR
εκεινο εις ο ενεβησαν οι μαθηται του ιησου ℵ
εις ο ενεβησαν οι μαθηται αυτου ιησου D
omit P^{75} B W A BO

τοις μαθηταις αυτου TR P^{75} B D W A BO
αυτοις ℵ

απηλθον TR P^{75} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

6:23 αλλα TR P^{75} B D W BO
ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲉⲛⲕⲉ A
omit ℵ

δε TR
ⲁⲩⲱ A

εγγυς του τοπου TR P^{75} ℵ B D A BO
omit W

ευχαριστησαντος του κυριου TR P^{75} ℵ B W A
ⲉⲧⲁϥϣⲉⲡϩⲙⲟⲧ ⲛϫⲉⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ BO
ⲉⲧϩⲁⲡϫ̅ⲥ̅ ϣⲉⲡϩⲙⲁⲧ ⲉϩⲣⲏⲓ̈ ⲉϫⲱϥ F
omit D

6:24 ο οχλος TR P^{75} B D W A BO F
omit ℵ

οτι ιησους ουκ εστιν εκει TR BO F
ⲁⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛⲙⲙⲉⲩ A

ουδε οι μαθηται αυτου TR BO F
omit A

ενεβησαν και αυτοι εις τα πλοια TR P^{75} B D W BO
ανεβησαν εις τα πλοια ℵ F
ⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲧⲁⲩ ⲙⲛⲛⲟⲩⲉϫⲏⲩ A

6:25 ευροντες TR P^{75} ℵ D W
* ⲁⲩϭⲓⲛⲉ A BO
μη ευροντες B

θαλασσης TR A
ⲓⲟⲣⲇⲁⲛⲏⲥ BO

expl. ειπον, 6:26 inc. ζητειτε F

ποτε TR BO

ⲛ[ⲉ ϣ] ⲛϩⲉ   A

6:26 αυτοις   TR   BO
omit   A

ζητειτε   TR BDW   A   BO F
omit   ℵ

ειδετε   TR   BO   F
ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲉⲩ   A

σημεια   TR P^{75} ℵ B W   A   BO   F
σημεια   και   τερατα   D

εσφραγισεν   TR P^{75} B D W   A   BO   F
omit   ℵ

6:28 ποιουμεν   TR P^{75} ℵ B W   A   BO   F
εργασωμεθα   D

εργαζωμεθα   τα   εργα   TR   A   F
ποιησωμεν   τα   εργα   D   BO

6:29 αυτοις   TR   A   F
omit   BO

expl.   απεστειλεν,   6:31   inc.   εφαγον   F

εκεινος   TR   A
omit   BO   F

6:30 συ   TR P^{75} ℵ B D   A
omit   W

τι   εργαζη   TR   A
ⲟⲩ   ⲡⲉⲧⲕⲓⲣⲓ   BO

6:31 αρτον   TR P^{75} B D W   A   BO
omit   ℵ

εδωκεν   TR   BO   F
* ⲁϥϯ   sic   A

6:32 μωσης   TR
μωυσης P^{75} ℵ B D W   A   BO   F

6:33 expl.   διδους,   6:35   inc.   εις   εμε

6:35 πειναση   TR P^{75} ℵ B W   A   BO
πειναση   πωποτε   D

6:36 υμιν οτι TR A
omit BO

εωρακατε TR BO
ΤΕΤΝΑΝΕȣ A

πιστευετε TR P^{66} ℵ B D BO
πιστευεται μοι W
ΤΕΤΝΑΡΠΙϹΤΕȣΕ A

6:37 παν ... ηξει TR A
ΝΗ ΤΗΡΟȣ ... ϹΕΝΑΙ BO

διδωσι TR A
ΕΤΑϤΤΗΙΤΟȣ BO

και τον ερχομενον προς με TR BO (F)
omit A

6:38 καταβεβηκα ... ουκ ινα TR P^{66} B D W A BO
ου καταβεβηκα ... ινα ℵ

εκ του ουρανου TR A F
ϨΕΝΤΦΕ ϨΕΝΤΦΕ sic BO

με TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO F
με πατρος D

6:39 το θελημα του πεμψαντος με πατρος TR
το θελημα του πεμψαντος με P^{66} P^{75} B D W A
omit ℵ
ΠΕϤΟȣΩϢ BO

παν ο δεδωκε TR
ΝΕΝΤΑȣΤΕΕΤΟȣ ... ΤΗΡΟȣ A BO (ΝΕΝΤΑϤ- alternate reading in A)

μη απολεσω TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A
μη απολεσω μηδεν D BO

εξ αυτου TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

αυτο TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D
αυτον W
-οȣ A BO

6:40 τουτο δε εστι το θελημα TR
τουτο γαρ εστιν το θελημα ℵ BD W A
τουτο εστιν το θελημα P^{75}
omit P^{66}
ΦΑΙ ΓΑΡΠΕ ΠΕϤΟȣΩϢ BO

του πεμψαντος με TR
του πατρος μου p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A
omit BO

εχη TR
* ⲉϥⲁϫⲓ A
* ⲛ̣ⲧⲟϥϫⲓ BO

αυτον (2) TR
-ⲟϥ BO

εγω TR p^{75} ℵ B W A
omit p^{66} D

6:42 και την μητερα TR p^{66} p^{75} B D A BO
omit ℵ W

ουν λεγει ουτος TR ℵ D
ουν λεγει p^{66} A F
νυν λεγει p^{75} B W BO

εκ TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A
εγω εκ ℵ

6:43 expl. μετ, 6:44 inc. εκλυση F

6:44 αυτον (1) TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A F
προς με W
-ϥ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ BO

6:45 εστι TR F
εστι γαρ A

ακουσας TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A F
ακουων D BO (ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ)

μαθων TR A F
ⲛⲧⲟϥⲉⲙⲓ BO (conjunctive following future)

6:46 τις εωρακεν TR BO
* ⲁϥⲛⲉϥ A
* ϩⲁϥⲛⲉϥ F

ει μη TR BO F
ⲙⲡⲉⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲛⲉϥⲁⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ A

θεου TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A BO F
πατρος ℵ

ουτος TR p^{66} ℵ B D A BO F
αυτος W

πατερα (2) TR P66 BDW A BO F
θεον ℵ

6:47 ο πιστευων εις εμε TR BO
ο πιστευων P66 P75 ℵBDW A

6:48 expl. εγω ειμι, 6:51 inc. φαγη F

6:49 το μαννα TR P66 ℵBW A BO
τον αρτον... το μαννα D

6:50 τις εξ αυτου φαγη TR A
* ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲙⲙⲟϥ BO

6:51 εγω ειμι ο αρτος TR A
εγω ειμι ο αρτος εγω ειμι ο αρτος sic BO

ο ζων TR A
* ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲱⲛϧ BO

εαν τις φαγη TR A
* ⲁⲣⲉⲩⲁⲓ BO

τουτο του αρτου TR P66 BDW A BO
του εμου του αρτου ℵ

εγω (2) TR BO F
omit A

δωσω (1) TR A
-ϯⲛⲁⲧⲏⲓϥ ⲛⲁϥ BO

ην εγω δωσω TR D
omit P66 P75 ℵBW A BO F

6:52 expl. αλληλους, 6:55 inc. αληθως (2) F

λεγοντες TR A
omit BO

6:53 μη TR P66 (P75) ℵBD A BO
omit W

φαγητε TR P66 P75 ℵBW A BO
λαβητε D

ζωην TR P66 BDW A BO
ζωην αιωνιον ℵ

6:54 ο τρωγων μου την σαρκα και πινων TR P75 ℵBW BO
ο τρωγων P66

ο τρωγων αυτου την σαρκαν D A

μου το αιμα TR p66 p75 ℵ B W BO
αυτου το αιμα D A

6:55 αληθως εστι βρωσις και το αιμα μου TR
αληθης εστιν βρωσις και το αιμα μου p66 p75 B D W A BO
omit ℵ

και το αιμα μου αληθως εστι ποσις TR ℵ
και το αιμα μου αληθης εστι ποσις p66 p75 B W A BO F
omit D

6:56 το αιμα TR p66 p75 ℵ B D A BO F
το αιμα εχει ζωην αιωνιον καγω αναστησω αυτον τη
εσχατη ημερα η γαρ σαρξ μου αληθης εστιν βρωσις και το
αιμα μου αληθης εστιν ποσις ο τρωγων μου την σαρκα και
πινων μου το αιμα W

καγω εν αυτω TR A F
* ⲀⲚⲞⲔ ϨⲰ ϮϢⲞⲠ ⲚϨⲎⲦϤ BO

αυτω TR p66 p75 ℵ B W A BO F
αυτω καθως εν εμοι ο πατηρ, καγω εν τω πατρι αμην
αμην λεγω υμειν, εαν μη λαβητε το σωμα του υιου του
ανθρωπου ως τον αρτον της ζωης, ουκ εχετε ζωην εν
αυτω D

6:57 expl. πατερα, 6:59 inc. διδασκων F

τρωγων TR p66 p75 ℵ B W A BO
λαμβανων D

6:58 καταβας TR p75 B D W A BO
καταβαινων p66 ℵ

το μαννα TR
omit p66 p75 ℵ B D W A BO

6:59 καπερναουμ TR p66 p75 ℵ B W A BO F
καπερναουμ σαββατω D

6:60 ακουσαντες TR F
omit A BO

6:61 περι τουτου TR BO F
omit A

αυτοις TR p75 ℵ B D W A F
αυτοις ιησους p66
ⲚⲰⲞⲨ ϪⲈⲈⲒⲤϪⲈ BO

6:63 ωφελει TR A
* ⲘⲠⲈⲤϮϨⲎⲞⲨ

λαλω TR
λελαληκα P^{66} ℵ B D W A F

πνευμα TR
ϨⲈⲚⲠ̅Ⲛ̅Ⲁ̅ A BO

εστιν TR P^{66} B D W A
omit ℵ BO

6:64 οι TR
* omit A

πιστευουσιν TR ℵ B D W A BO
πιστευσουσι P^{66}

ο ιησους TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
ο σωτηρ ℵ

τινες εισιν οι μη πιστευοντες και TR P^{75} B D W F
τινες εισιν οι πιστευοντες και ℵ
omit P^{66} BO
ⲚⲒⲘ ⲠⲈⲦⲢⲠⲒⲤⲦⲈⲨⲈ ⲈⲚ A

6:65 αυτω TR P^{66} B D W A BO F
omit ℵ

του πατρος μου TR D
του πατρος P^{66} ℵ B W BO F

6:66 των TR ℵ D W BO F
εκ των P^{66} B A (ϨN)

ουκετι μετ αυτου περιεπατουν TR BO
* ⲀⲨⲖⲀ [ⲀⲂⲀⲖ ⲈⲨⲘⲀ]ⲀϨⲈ ⲚⲘⲘⲈϤ A
ⲚⲀⲨⲘⲀϢⲈ ... ⲚⲘ[Ⲙ]ⲈϤ ⲈⲚ F

6:67 μη TR F
ⲘⲎϪⲒ BO

6:68 απεκριθη TR P^{66} (P^{75}) ℵ B W A BO
ειπεν D

αιωνιου TR BO
omit A

εχεις TR (A) (F)
ⲈⲦⲔⲤⲀϪⲒ ⲘⲰⲞⲨ BO

6:69 εγνωκαμεν TR p^{66} ℵBW A BO
εγνωκαμεν σε D

ο χριστος TR p^{66} A F
omit p^{75} ℵBDW BO

ο υιος του θεου ζωντος TR
ο αγιος του θεου p^{66} (p^{75}) ℵBDW A BO

6:70 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους TR p^{66} p^{75} BW BO
απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις ℵ D (F)
ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ ϫⲓⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ A

6:71 ελεγε TR A BO
* ⲁϥϫⲱ F

σιμωνος TR A F
ⲡⲥⲓⲙⲟⲛ BO

ουτος γαρ ημελλεν αυτον παραδιδοναι TR A BO
ⲡ̣[ⲉ]ⲧ̣ⲛⲉⲡⲁⲣⲁⲇⲓⲇⲟⲩ ⲙ̣[ⲙⲁϥ] F

7:1 εν τη γαλιλαια TR BO
ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲛⲅⲁⲗⲓⲗⲁⲓⲁ A

γαρ TR A F
ϫⲉ BO

ηθελεν TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵBD A BO
ειχεν εξουσιαν W

περιπατειν TR A
ⲉⲙⲟϣⲓ ϧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ BO

expl. οτι, 7:3 inc. τα εργα σου F

7:2 ην ... εγγυς TR A
* ⲛⲉⲁϥϧⲱⲛⲧ BO

7:3 ουν TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵBD A
και W

εντευθεν TR A
omit BO

σου (2) TR p^{66} p^{75} BDW
omit ℵ BO

7:4 τι ποιει TR
* ⲣϩⲱ̣ⲃ A F
* ⲉⲣⲟⲩϩⲱⲃ BO

ζητει αυτος εν παρρησια ειναι TR A F
* ⲛⲧⲉϥⲕⲱϯ ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛϩϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ BO

7:5 επιστευον TR A F
ⲛⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧⲉ- ... ⲛⲁϩϯ BO

αυτον TR p^{66} ℵ B W A F
αυτον τοτε D BO (ⲙⲡⲓⲥⲏⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲙⲁ)

7:6 expl. καιρος (1), 7:10 inc. ως ... ανεβησαν F

ουπω TR p^{66} B D W BO
ου ℵ

εστιν ετοιμος TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ D W
παρεστιν ετοιμος B
ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛⲥⲏⲟⲩ ... ϥⲛⲏⲟⲩ BO

7:7 περι αυτου TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

7:8 ταυτην (1) TR ℵ
omit p^{66} p^{75} B D W A BO

ουπω (1) TR p^{66} p^{75} B W A BO
ουκ ℵ D

ταυτην (2) TR BO
omit A

7:9 αυτοις TR p^{75} B
αυτος p^{66} ℵ D W A BO

7:10 ως ... ανεβησαν TR A
ⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲓ ... ⲉⲧⲁⲩϣⲉ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ BO

ως (2) TR p^{66} (p^{75}) B W
omit ℵ D A BO F

7:11 ουν TR
ϩⲱⲟⲩ F

expl. ιουδαιοι, 7:28 inc. διδασκων A

7:12 πολυς TR p^{75} ℵ B W BO
omit p^{66} D

7:13 μεντοι TR
δε BO

expl. περι αυτου, 7:16 inc. ουκ εστιν εμη F

7:14 ηδη TR
omit BO

εδιδασκε TR
* ⲁϥϯⲥⲃⲱ BO

7:15 εθαυμαζον TR
* ⲁϫⲉⲣϣⲫⲏⲣⲓ BO

7:17 θελη το θελημα αυτου ποιειν TR P^{66} ℵ B D BO
θελη το θελημα αυτου P^{75}
το θελημα αυτου ποιη W

7:18 expl. ζητων, 7:19 inc. αποκτειναι F

και αδικια εν αυτω ουκ εστιν TR
omit BO

7:19 μωσης TR
μωυσης P^{66} (P^{75}) ℵ B D W BO

7:20 και ειπε TR D
omit P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W BO F

7:21 αυτοις TR P^{66} (P^{75}) ℵ B W BO
omit D

παντες TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W BO
omit D

7:22 δια τουτο TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W BO F
omit ℵ

μωσης TR
μωυσης P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W BO

expl. μωσεως, 7:24 inc. κρισιν F

μωσεως TR ℵ
μωυσεως P^{66} B D W BO

εστιν TR
* Ⲛⲉϫⲉ BO

αλλ TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W BO
αλλ οτι ℵ

7:23 μωσεως TR D
μωυσεως P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W BO

εμοι χολατε TR

* ΕΘΒΕΟΥ ΤΕΤΕΝϪΟΝΤ ΕΡΟΙ BO

7:25 εκ TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W (F)
omit ℵ BO

ον ζητουσιν TR
* ΦΗ ΕΝΑΥΚΩϮ ΝϹΩ" BO

7:26 μηποτε TR P^{66} B D W
μητι ℵ BO

οι αρχοντες TR P^{66} B D W
οι αρχιερεις ℵ
ΝΙΑΡΧΩΝ ΝΕΜΝΙΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥϹ BO (F)

expl. αρχοντες, 7:35 μη F

αληθως (2) TR
omit P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W BO

7:27 ο δε χριστος TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W BO
ο χριστος οταν ελθη μη πλιονα σημια ποιησει η ℵ

γινωσκει TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W BO
γινωσκει αυτον ℵ

ποθεν εστιν (2) TR
ΘΩΝΠΕ ΙΕ ϤΝΗΟΥ ΝΝΑϢ ΕΝΡΗϮ BO

7:28 διδασκων TR A
omit BO

και (2) TR A
ϪΕ BO

ον υμεις ουκ οιδατε TR
omit A

7:29 εγω δε οιδα αυτον, οτι παρ αυτου ειμι κακεινος με απεστειλεν TR BO
omit A

7:30 την χειρα P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D A
τας χειρας W BO

7:31 επιστευσαν TR
ΝΑϨϮ BO

μητι TR D
μη P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO

τουτων TR D
omit P66 P75 ℵ B W A BO

7:32 γογγυζοντος TR
ⲉϥⲭⲣⲉⲙⲣⲉⲙ ... ⲉϥϫⲱ BO

ταυτα TR P66 (P75) ℵ B W A BO
omit D

οι φαρισαιοι και οι αρχιερεις TR
οι αρχιερεις και οι φαρισαιοι P66 P75 ℵ B D W A BO

7:33 αυτοις TR
omit P66 P75 ℵ B D W A BO

μεθ υμων ειμι TR A
* ⲉϯⲛⲁⲁⲓϥ ⲛⲉⲙⲱⲧⲉⲛ BO

πεμψαντα TR P66 ℵ B D W BO
πεμψοντα P75

7:34 ζητησετε TR P66 ℵ B D W A BO
ζητησατε P75

ειμι TR A
ϯⲛⲁϣⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ BO

7:35 προς εαυτους TR P66 P75 B D W A BO
omit ℵ

ημεις TR P66 (P75) B W A
omit ℵ D

μη TR P66 P75 ℵ B W A F
μητι D BO

7:36 ουκ ευρησετε και TR A F
omit BO

ειμι TR A F
ϯⲛⲁ BO

υμεις TR P75 ℵ B D W A
omit P66 F

7:37 εν δε τη εσχατη ημερα τη μεγαλη της εορτης TR P75 ℵ B
D A
εν δε τη εσχατη ημερα της μεγαλη εορτης P66 BO F
εν δε τη εσχατη ημερα της εορτης W

εκραξε TR A

* ⲁϥⲱϣ BO

εαν τις διψα TR
* ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲃⲉ A BO

expl. ερχεσθω, 6:39 inc. εδοξασθη F

προς με TR p^{75} B W A BO
omit p^{66} ℵ D

7:38 υδατος ζωντος TR A
* ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩⲛⲱⲛϧ BO

7:39 εμελλον λαμβανειν TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A BO
ελαμβανον W

οι πιστευοντες TR ℵ D
οι πιστευσαντες p^{66} B W BO

ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα αγιον TR p^{66} D W
ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα p^{75} ℵ
ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα αγιον δεδομενον B
ⲛⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧⲟⲩϫⲓ ⲡ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ (A) BO

7:40 πολλοι TR p^{66} D
omit p^{75} ℵ B W
ϩⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉ (A) BO F

τον λογον TR
αυτου των λογων τουτων p^{66} ℵ D
των λογων τουτων p^{75} B F
των λογων αυτου W
ⲛⲓⲥⲁϫⲓ BO

ελεγον TR F
* ⲉⲩ[ϫⲱ] A
* ⲡⲉϫⲱⲟⲩ BO

7:41 αλλοι (2) TR ℵ D BO F
οι p^{66} p^{75} B W A ([ϩ]ⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉ)

γαρ TR
omit A F

7:42 ουχι TR BO F
omit A

ειπεν TR BO
* ϣⲁⲣⲉ... ϫⲟⲟⲥ A

expl. η γραφη... ο χριστος, 8:39 inc. τα εργα F

δαβιδ (1) TR
δαυειδ p^{66} p^{75} B A BO

δαβιδ (2) TR
δαυειδ p^{66} p^{75} B A BO

7:44 εθελον TR p^{66} p^{75} BDW A BO
ελεγον ℵ

7:45 εκεινοι TR BO
omit A

7:46 απεκριθησαν οι υπηρεται TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A
απεκριθησαν αυτοις οι υπηρεται W
ⲁⲩⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ ⲛϫⲉ ⲛⲓϩⲩⲡⲏⲣⲉⲧⲏⲥ ⲡⲉϫⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ BO

ουδεποτε ουτως ελαλησεν ανθρωπος ως ουτως ο
ανθρωπος TR A BO
ουδεποτε ουτως ανθρωπος ελαλησεν ως ουτος λαλει ο
ανθρωπος p^{66} ℵ
ουδεποτε ουτως ανθρωπος ελαλησεν ως ουτως λαλει D
ουδεποτε ελαλησεν ουτως ανθρωπος (p^{75}) BW

7:47 αυτοις TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ D W
omit B A BO

7:48 εκ των TR p^{66} ℵ B D A BO
των W

επιστευσεν TR p^{66} BD W A BO
πιστευει ℵ

7:49 ο οχλος TR BO
omit A

7:50 νυκτος TR D
το προτερον p^{66} B W A BO
omit ℵ
νυκτος το πρωτον D

7:51 ο νομος ημων TR BO
ΠΝΟΜΟC sic A

παρ αυτου προτερον TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W BO
πρωτον ℵ
παρ αυτου A

7:52 ερευνησον TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B BO
εραυνησον τας γραφας W D A

προφητης TR A

ⲡⲭ̅ⲥ̅ . ⲓⲉ ⲡⲓⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ BO

ουκ TR BO
* omit sic A

7:53 – 8:11 TR D
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO

8:12 ελαλησε TR BO
* ⲉϥⲥⲉϫⲉ A

εξει TR
ϥⲛⲁϫⲓ A BO

8:14 απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις TR p^{66} p^{75} BDW BO
απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν A
ειπεν αυτοις ο ιησους ℵ

υμεις δε ουκ οιδατε ποθεν ερχομαι και που υπαγω TR
omit A BO

8:15 ου κρινω TR A
ⲙⲡⲓϯϩⲁⲡ BO

8:16 πατηρ TR p^{66} p^{75} BW A BO
omit ℵ D

8:18 μαρτυρει περι εμου TR p^{66} ℵBDW A BO
περι εμου μαρτυρει περι εμου p^{75}

ο πεμψας TR BO
omit A

8:19 ιησους TR p^{66} p^{75} BW A
ιησους και ειπεν ℵ BO
ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις D

ουτε τον πατερα μου TR BO
ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ ⲉⲛ ⲙⲡⲁⲕⲉⲉⲓⲱⲧ A

ταυτα τα ρηματα TR A
ταυτα BO

ο ιησους TR D
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO

διδασκων εν τω ιερω TR p^{66} p^{75} BDW A BO
omit ℵ

ουπω εληλυθει TR BO
ⲙⲡⲁⲧⲉ ... ⲉⲓ A

8:21 ειπεν... παλιν αυτοις ο ιησους TR D
ειπεν... παλιν αυτοις P^{66} B W A BO
ειπεν... αυτοις ℵ

8:22 εγω TR P^{66} ℵ B D W A
omit P^{75}

8:23 και TR P^{75} B D W A
ουν P^{66} ℵ

κατω TR BO
* ϩⲛⲡⲕⲁϩ A

ανω TR BO
* ϩⲛⲧⲡⲉ A

8:24 ουν TR P^{75} B D W
αλλα A

πιστευσητε TR P^{66} P^{75} B W A BO
πιστευσητε μοι ℵ D

αποθανεισθε εν ταις αμαρτιαις υμων TR A
omit BO

8:25 την αρχην οτι και λαλω υμιν TR P^{66} P^{75} D W
την αρχην οτι και εν λαλω υμιν ℵ
ϫⲓⲛ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲡ ϯⲥⲉϫⲉ ⲛⲙⲙⲏⲧⲛ A
ⲉⲡⲓⲇⲏ ⲁⲓⲉⲣⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲥⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲉⲙⲱⲧⲉⲛ BO

8:26 εχω TR A
ⲟⲩⲟⲛϯ ⲕⲉ- BO

ο πεμψας με TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
ο πεμψας με πατηρ ℵ

λεγω TR
λαλω P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W BO

8:27 αυτοις TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
αυτου D

ελεγεν TR P^{66} P^{75} B W
* ⲛⲧⲁϥⲥⲉϫⲉ A BO
ελεγεν τον θεον ℵ D

8:28 ειπεν ... αυτοις ο ιησους TR P^{75} A BO
ειπεν ... ο ιησους P^{66} B W
ειπεν ... αυτοις ο ιησους παλιν ℵ D

ο πατηρ μου TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D A BO

omit W

ταυτα TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
ουτως ℵ

8:29 ο πατηρ TR
omit P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

τα αρεστα αυτω TR BO
* ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲉⲛⲉ̣[ϥ] A

8:31 ιησους TR A
omit BO

8:33 απεκριθησαν αυτω TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
απεκριθησαν προς αυτον και ειπεν D

8:34 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους TR P^{66} ℵ B D W A
απεκριθη ιησους P^{75}
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ ⲛϫⲉ ⲓⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ BO

πας TR BO
omit A

ο ποιων την αμαρτιαν δουλος εστι της αμαρτιας TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A
ο ποιων την αμαρτιαν δουλος εστι D
ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ... ⲉⲧⲉⲛϥⲓⲣⲓ ⲁⲛ ⲛϯⲙⲉⲑⲙⲏⲓ ⲟⲩⲃⲱⲕ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲛⲟⲃⲓⲡⲉ BO

8:35 ο υιος μενει εις τον αιωνα TR P^{66} P^{75} B D A BO
omit ℵ W

8:36 ο υιος TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D A BO
omit W

ελευθεροι εσεσθε TR A
* ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛ ϩⲁⲛⲣⲉⲙϩⲉ BO

8:37 σπερμα ... εστε TR P^{75} ℵ B D
σπερμα ... εσται P^{66} W
* ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲛ ⲡⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ A BO

8:38 ο (1) TR
α P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

πατρι μου TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B A
πατρος ταυτα D W BO

ο (2) TR D
α P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO

εωρακατε παρα τω πατρι υμων ποιειτε TR p^{66} ℵ
A (imperative) BO (present)
ηκουσατε παρα του πατρος υμων ποιειτε BW
ηκουσατε παρα του πατρος λαλειτε p^{75}
εωρακατε παρα τω πατρι υμων ταυτα ποιειτε D

8:39 λεγει TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A BO
απεκριθη ℵ

αυτοις TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

ητε TR W A BO
εστε p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D

εποιειτε TR p^{75} ℵ D W A BO
ποιειτε p^{66} B

8:40 ος ... λελαληκα TR
ⲉⲁϥϫⲱ A BO

ην ηκουσα TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W
ην ηκουσεν D A BO F

τουτο αβρααμ ουκ εποιησεν TR A (F)
ⲫⲁⲓ ⲙⲡⲉⲁⲃⲣⲁⲁⲙ ⲁⲓϥ ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲓⲣⲓ ⲙⲙⲟϥ BO

8:41 αυτω TR BO
omit A

ενα πατερα TR A (F)
ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲟⲩⲓⲱⲧ BO

8:42 expl. θεος, 8:42 inc. F

εγω TR p^{75} ℵ B D W A
omit p^{66}

και ηκω TR A
omit BO

8:43 λαλιαν TR BO
* ϭⲓⲛⲥⲉϫⲉ A F

γινωσκετε TR BO
ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ' A F

8:44 αληθεια (2) TR F
omit BO

και (3) TR A F

ΜΦΡΗϮ BO

8:45 οτι TR F
omit A BO

αληθειαν TR A (F)
ΘΗΜΙ ΝωΤΕΝ BO

expl. πιστευετε, 8:49 inc. εγω F

μοι TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W
μοι υμεις D

8:46 τις ... δια τι TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

υμεις TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D
omit W A

μοι TR p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
omit p^{66}

8:47 οτι εκ του θεου ουκ εστε TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

8:48 ου TR BO
omit A

λεγομεν TR p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
ελεγομεν p^{66}

8:49 απεκριθη ιησους TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A BO
απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν ℵ

expl. εγω, 8:55 inc. και (3) F

8:51 θανατον ου μη θεωρηση TR BO
ΝΝΕϤϪΕΜϮΠΙ ΜΦΜΟΥ BO

8:52 θανατου TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W BO
omit ℵ

εις τον αιωνα TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W BO
omit D A

8:53 πατρος ημων TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B A
omit D W BO

οστις TR p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
οτι p^{66} D

απεθανον TR BO
omit A

συ (2) TR D
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A

8:54 απεκριθη ιησους TR A
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ ⲛϫⲉⲓⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ BO

λεγετε TR A
ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲟϥ BO

θεος υμων εστι TR ℵ B D
θεος ημων εστιν p^{66} p^{75} W BO
ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉⲡⲉ sic A

8:55 ειπω TR p^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
ειπω υμιν p^{75}

8:56 expl. ο πατηρ υμων, 9:2 inc λεγοντες F

ινα ιδη την ημεραν την εμην TR A
ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲛⲁϥ ⲉⲩⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲏⲓ BO

8:57 αβρααμ εωρακας TR p^{66} B D W
αβρααμ εωρακεν σε p^{75} ℵ A BO

8:58 αμην αμην λεγω υμιν TR BO
omit A

8:59 ουν TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A
τοτε D

διελθων δια μεσου αυτων και παρηγεν ουτως TR
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

9:1 παραγων TR BO
* ⲉϥⲙⲁⲁϩⲉ A

τυφλον εκ γενετης TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W
* ⲉⲁⲩϫⲡⲁϥ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛⲃⲗⲗ[ⲉ] A
* ⲃⲉⲗⲗⲉ ⲙⲙⲓⲥⲉ BO
τυφλον εκ γενετης καθημενον D

9:2 expl. οι γονεις αυτου, 9:6 inc. επτυσε

9:4 εμε TR A
ημας p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W BO

με TR B D A
ημας p^{66} p^{75} ℵ W BO

εως TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A
ως W BO

ερχεται νυξ TR BO
ⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧⲉⲧⲟⲩϣⲏ ϣⲱⲡⲉ A

9:5 οταν TR
* ϩⲉⲱⲥ A
* ϩⲟⲥ BO

ω TR p^{75} ℵ B D W BO
omit p^{66}

9:6 χαμαι TR A BO
* ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ F

expl. πτυσματος, 9:8 inc. προσαιτων F

επεχρισε TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ D W A BO
επεθηκεν B

του τυφλου TR W
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A BO

9:7 αυτω TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

νιψαι TR
ⲕⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲕϩⲟ A BO

απεσταλμενος TR BO
* ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲧⲛⲛⲁⲟⲩϥ A

ουν και ενιψατο και ηλθε TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ D W
ⲁϥⲃⲱⲕ ϭⲉ ⲁϥⲓⲁⲡⲉϥϩⲟ A
ⲁϥϣⲉ ⲛⲁϥ ⲇⲉ ⲁϥⲓⲱⲓ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁϥⲓ BO
omit B

βλεπων TR BO
* ⲁϥⲛⲉⲩ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ A

9:8 γειτονες TR p^{75} ℵ B D W A
γειτονες αυτου p^{66}

οι θεωρουντες TR A
ⲉⲛⲁⲩⲥⲱⲟⲩⲛ BO

τυφλος TR
προσαιτης p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

9:9 αλλοι TR BO F

* ϩαεινε A

αλλοι TR D A BO
αλλοι ελεγον P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W

οτι ομοιος αυτω εστιν TR D A F
ουχι αλλα ομοιος αυτω εστιν P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W BO

εκεινος TR
ντaϥ A BO

9:10 αυτω TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
οι ιουδαιοι αυτω ℵ

ανεωχθησαν σου οι οφθαλμοι TR
* αϫοϫεν ϫινεκ β̣[ε λ] A
ακναϫ μβολ BO

9:11 απεκριθη εκεινος και ειπεν TR
απεκριθη και ειπεν BO
απεκριθη εκεινος P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W
απεκριθη A

ανθρωπος TR P^{75} D W
ο ανθρωπος P^{66} ℵ B A (πιρωμε)

την κολυμβηθραν TR D
omit P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO F

νιψαι TR
νκιαπεκϩο A F
ϊωϊ ννεκβαλ εβολ BO

δε TR
ουν P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W A

νιψαμενος TR
αειαπαϩο A
αϊϊωι μμωοϫ εβολ BO

ανεβλεψα TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO F
ηλθον βλεπων D

9:12 εκεινος TR A BO
* νει sic F

λεγει TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO F
λεγει αυτοις D

9:13 αγουσιν TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO F
αγουσιν και αγουσιν D

αυτον TR BO
* ⲁⲣⲉⲧⲟⲩ sic A F

9:14 οτε TR D A F
εν η ημερα p66 p75 ℵ B W BO

9:15 ηρωτων TR
* ⲁⲩϫⲛⲟⲩ" A BO F

πηλον επεθηκεν επι τους οφθαλμους μου TR
ⲛⲧⲁϥⲥⲁⲗ[ϭ] ⲟⲩⲁⲙⲉ ⲁⲛⲁⲃⲉⲗ A (F)
ⲁϥⲑⲁⲙⲓⲟ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲟⲙⲓ ⲁϥⲧⲏⲓ̈ϥ ⲉⲛⲁⲃⲁⲗ BO

expl. οφθαλμους μου, 9:16 inc. ελεγον F

ενιψαμην TR
ⲁⲓⲓ̈ⲱⲓ ⲙⲙⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ BO
ⲁⲉⲓⲁⲡⲁϩⲟ A

βλεπω TR
ⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉⲩ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ A

9:16 ελεγον (2) TR BO F
* ⲉⲩϫⲱ A

expl. θεου, 9:17 inc. προφητης F

9:17 τυφλω TR p66 p75 B D W A
ποτε τυφλω ℵ
ⲃⲉⲗⲗⲉ ⲙⲙⲓⲥⲉ BO

παλιν TR p66 p75 ℵ B W BO
omit D A

9:18 ουκ επιστευσαν TR
* ⲛⲉⲩⲣⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲛ A BO
ⲛⲉⲙⲡⲟⲩⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ F

περι αυτου TR A F
ⲙⲙⲟϥ BO

οτι τυφλος ην και αναβλεψεν TR p66 p75 ℵ B W A BO F
omit D

expl. εφωνησαν, 9:21 inc. η τις F

του αναβλεψαντος TR p75 ℵ B D W A BO
omit p66

9:19 λεγοντες TR p66 p75 B D
omit ℵ W A BO

ουτος TR p^{66} p^{75} B W A BO
ει ουτος ℵ D

υμεις TR
omit A

εγεννηθη TR BO
ⲚⲦⲀⲚϪⲠⲀϤ A

9:20 αυτοις TR D
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO

οιδαμεν οτι TR BO
omit A

οτι (2) TR A
omit BO

εγεννηθη TR BO
ⲚⲦⲀⲚϪⲠⲀϤ A.

9:21 η TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A BO F
omit W

αυτος ηλικιαν εχει TR A
ⲦⲈϤⲘⲀⲒⲎ ⲚⲦⲀϤ ϨⲰϤ BO

αυτον ερωτησατε TR p^{66} B D BO
omit p^{75} ℵ W A F

αυτος περι αυτου λαλησει TR p^{66} p^{75} B D
περι αυτου λαλησει ℵ W
ⲚⲤⲈϪⲈ ϨⲀⲢⲀϤ A BO F

9:22 expl. εφοβουντο, 9:24 inc. εφωνησαν F

ηδη TR A
omit BO

9:22 γαρ TR A
* ϪⲈⲄⲎⲒ BO

εαν τις αυτον ομολογηση TR A
* ⲪⲎ ⲈⲦⲚⲀϪⲞⲤ BO

χριστον TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W
χριστον ειναι D
Ⲡ$\overline{\text{ⲬⲤ}}$ ⲠⲈ A BO

9:25 και ειπεν TR
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO F

ει αμαρτωλος εστιν ουκ οιδα· TR BO (F)
ϯⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ ⲉⲛ ⲁⲛⲁⲕ ϫⲉ ⲟ̣ⲩⲣⲙⲉϥⲣⲛⲁⲃⲉⲡⲉ [ⲁ]ⲛⲁⲕ A

εν οιδα TR BO F
* ⲡⲉϯⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ ⲙⲙⲁϥ A

expl. εν, 9:27 inc. ηδη F

9:26 παλιν TR p^{66}
omit p^{75} ℵ B W A BO

σοι TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A
σοι και D
ⲛⲁⲕ ⲓⲉ BO

9:27 απεκριθη αυτοις TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W BO
ειπεν D
ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲁⲥ A

ουκ TR p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO F
omit p^{66}

παλιν TR A F
omit BO

9:28 συ ει μαθητης εκεινου TR A F
ⲛⲑⲟⲕ ⲉⲕⲉⲉⲣⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲁϥ BO

δε TR p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
γαρ p^{66}

μωσεως TR p^{66} B
μωυσεως p^{75} ℵ D W A BO F

9:29 μωση TR
μωυσει p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO F

expl. οιδαμεν (2), 9:30 inc. ειπεν F

θεος TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO F
θεος και οτι ο θεος αμαρτωλων ουκ ακουει D

9:30 αυτοις TR p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit p^{66} D F

εν γαρ τουτω θαυμαστον εστιν TR p^{75} ℵ B D W BO (ρω for γαρ)
τουτο γαρ το θαυμαστον εστιν p^{66} A F (ρω for γαρ)

9:31 θεοσεβης
* ⲉⲩⲣⲙⲛ[ⲛⲟⲩ]ⲧⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲉⲉ A
* ⲉⲩϣⲁⲙϣⲉⲛⲟⲩϯⲡⲉ BO F

ΤΟΥΤΟΥ TR BO
ⲁⲣⲁϥ A F

ακουει TR A
* ⲉϣⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ BO

9:32 ηκουσθη οτι ηνοιξε τις TR
* ⲙⲡⲉ ⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲥⲱⲧⲙ ϫⲉ ⲁ ⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲟⲩⲉⲛ A
* ⲙⲡⲉⲛⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ... ⲉⲁϥⲟⲩⲱⲛ BO (F)

οφθαλμους TR A F
* ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲃⲁⲗ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲃⲁⲗ sic BO

τυφλου γεγεννημενου TR F
* ⲉⲁϥϫⲡⲁϥ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛⲃⲗ[ⲗⲉ] A
* ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲃⲉⲗⲗⲉ ⲙⲙⲓⲥⲓ BO

9:33 expl. ουτος, 9:34 inc. εν αμαρτιαις ... ολος F

θεου TR p^{75} ℵBDW A BO
θεου ο ανθρωπος p^{66}

9:34 διδασκεις TR A BO
ⲉϥⲛⲉϯ ⲥⲃ̣ⲱ̣ sic F

και (2) TR A F
ⲧⲟⲧⲉ BO

9:35 ηκουσεν TR p^{66} p^{75} B D
και ηκουσεν ℵ F
ηκουσ̣εν δε W

ευρων TR A F
* ⲁϥϫⲉⲙ" BO

αυτω TR p^{66} A BO F
omit p^{75} ℵ B D W

συ πιστευεις TR
ⲁⲣⲓⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ A BO F

θεου TR
ανθρωπου p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO F

9:36 απεκριθη εκεινος και ειπε TR p^{66} ℵ D
και ... εφη p^{75} B W A BO F

ινα πιστευσω TR BO (F)
* ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲁ̣ⲣⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ A

9:37 ειπε TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO F απεκριθη D

εκεινος εστιν TR P^{75} ℵ B D W
αυτος εστιν P^{66} A BO
ⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲡⲉ ⲁϩⲁ F

9:38 ο δε εφη πιστευω κυριε και προσεκυνησεν αυτω TR P^{66} B D
omit P^{75} ℵ W A F
ο δε εφη πιστευω κυριε τοτε προσεκυνησεν αυτω BO

9:39 και ειπεν ο ιησους TR P^{66} B D
omit P^{75} ℵ W A F
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ ⲛϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ BO

εις τον κοσμον TR A F
ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ BO

τουτον TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A F
omit P^{66} BO

9:40 ταυτα TR P^{66} P^{75} B W BO
omit ℵ D A F

οντες μετ αυτου TR A BO
omit F

μη TR A F
ΜΗΤΙ BO

9:41 ιησους TR A F
omit BO

ει τυφλοι ητε TR A
* ϫⲉ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛⲟⲓ ⲙⲃⲉⲗⲗⲉ BO
ⲉ̣ⲛ̣ⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛ ϩⲉⲛⲃⲗⲗⲏ ⲣⲱ F

ουν TR
και P^{75} F
omit P^{66} ℵ B D W

αμαρτια υμων μενει TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B A F
αμαρτιαι υμων μενουσιν D W
* [ϥ]ⲥⲙⲟⲛⲧ ⲛϫⲉⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲃⲓ BO

10:1 αυλην των προβατων TR BO F
ⲛⲉⲥⲁϫ A

αλλα TR BO F
ⲁϫⲱ A

αναβαινων TR BO

αϥοϫωτβ αβαλ A F

expl. εκεινος, 10:2 inc. ποιμην F

κλεπτης ... και ληστης TR A
ληστης ... και κλεπτης BO

10:2 εισερχομενος TR P^{66} ℵ B D W BO
ερχομενος P^{75} A

ποιμην εστι TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B
εκεινος εστιν ο ποιμην W BO
αυτος εστιν ο ποιμην D

των προβατων TR A (F)
omit BO

10:3 ιδια TR BO F
omit A

εξαγει αυτα TR A (F)
omit BO

10:4 expl. οταν, 10:5 inc. μη ακολουθησωσιν F

οταν... και TR A
omit BO

τα ιδια προβατα TR
τα ιδια ℵ
τα ιδια παντα P^{66} P^{75} B D W A

10:6 ταυτην την παροιμιαν TR A F
φαι πιινιπε BO

εκεινοι TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO F
omit ℵ

τινα ην α ελαλει TR P^{75} ℵ B D W F
τι ελαλει P^{66} A
ενη ετεϥϫω BO

10:7 παλιν TR P^{75} ℵ B D A BO F
omit (P^{45}) P^{66} W

αυτοις TR P^{45} P^{66} ℵ D W A BO
omit P^{75} B

θυρα TR P^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
ποιμην P^{75} F

10:8 expl. παντες, 10:10 inc. ο κλεπτης F

παντες TR p66 p75 ℵ B W A BO F
omit D

προ εμου TR p66 B D W
omit (p45) p75 ℵ A BO

κλεπται ... και λησται TR A
λησται ... και κλεπται BO

10:9 θυρα TR A
ⲥⲃⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲛⲓⲉⲥⲱⲟⲩ BO

δι εμου TR BO
ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ A

εαν τις εισελθη TR A
* ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧⲛⲏⲟⲩ ⲉϧⲟⲩⲛ BO

και εισελευσεται TR p45 p66 p75 ℵ B D A BO
omit W

νομην TR
* ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁ ⲙⲙⲁⲛⲉ A BO

10:10 ερχεται TR BO
ⲙⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲗⲁⲩⲉ A (F)

ζωην TR p45 p66 p75 B D W A BO F
ζωην αιωνιον ℵ

εχωσι TR
* ⲉⲩⲁϫⲓ A BO F

και περισσον εχωσιν TR p45 p75 ℵ B W
omit p66 D
* ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲥⲉϫⲓ ⲟⲩϩⲟⲩⲟ A BO F

ο ποιμην ο καλος (2) TR A F
omit BO

τιθησιν TR p66 p75 B W A F
διδωσιν p45 ℵ D BO

10:12 ου ουκ εισι τα προβατα ιδια TR A
ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲁⲛⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲉⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲫⲁⲓ ⲙⲡⲁϥⲧⲏⲓ̈ϥ ⲉϩⲣⲏⲓ̈ ⲉϫⲉⲛⲛⲓⲉⲥⲱⲟⲩ
αλλα BO

expl. ιδια, 10:18 inc. αιρει F

θεωρει TR A
* ⲁϥϣⲁⲛⲛⲁⲩ BO

αυτα TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

τα προβατα (3) TR
omit P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

10:13 ο δε μισθωτος φευγει TR
omit P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

οτι μισθωτος εστι TR P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D A BO
omit W

ου μελει αυτω TR BO
ⲡϥⲣⲁⲟⲩϣ ⲉⲛⲡⲉ A

10:14 γινωσκομαι υπο των εμων TR
γινωσκουσι με τα εμα TR P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

10:15 τιθημι TR B D A
διδωμι P^{45} P^{66} ℵ W BO

10:16 εκ TR P^{45} P^{66} ℵ B D BO
omit W A

10:17 τιθημι TR A
ϯϯ BO

αυτην TR P^{66} ℵ B D A BO
αυτα W

10:18 αιρει TR P^{66} D W A BO
ηρεν P^{45} ℵ B

αλλ εγω τιθημι αυτην απ εμαυτου TR P^{66} (P^{75}) ℵ B W A BO F
omit D

παλιν TR BO
omit A

ταυτην την εντολην TR A
ⲑⲁⲓⲧⲉ ϯⲉⲛⲧⲟⲗⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲓⲧⲉ ϯⲉⲛⲧⲟⲗⲏ BO

10:21 αλλοι TR P^{45} P^{75} B D
αλλοι δε P^{66} ℵ W
[ϩⲉⲛ]ⲕⲁⲩⲓ̈ ⲁⲛ F

ελεγον TR BO F
* ⲉⲩϫⲱ A

10:22 δε TR ℵ D BO
TOTE p^{66} p^{75} B W A F (ϩνποȣαειϣ ετμμεȣ)

εγκαινια TR A F
* ΜΕΜΕΜΒΕΡΙ BO

10:24 αυτον TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A BO F
omit ℵ

10:25 απεκριθη αυτοις TR p^{75} B W A
απεκριθη p^{66} ℵ D
αϥεροȣω ... πεϫαϥ Νωοȣ BO F

ειπον TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A F
λαλω D

πιστευετε TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ W BO
επιστευσατε B
πιστευετε μοι D A

ταυτα TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B A
αυτα D BO (Νθωοȣ)
αυτα ταυτα τα εργα W

10:26 expl. υμεις, 11:22 inc. δωσει F

γαρ TR
οτι p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

καθως ειπον υμιν TR p^{66} D BO
omit p^{75} ℵ B W A

10:27 καγω TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A
και ℵ

και TR
Δε A

ακολουθουσι TR
ΝΤαϥ ... CεΝα ο[ȣα]ϩοȣ ΝCωει A

10:28 απολωνται TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A
αποληται ℵ

και ου μη απολωνται εις τον αιωνα TR A
omit BO

της χειρος μου TR
Ναϭιϫ A BO

10:29 μου (1) TR p^{66} B D W

omit (p75) ℵ BO

μοι TR ℵ B D W A BO
omit p66

μειζων παντων TR BO
ϩⲓϫⲛ ⲟⲩⲁ[ⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ] A

της χειρος TR BO
ⲛϭⲓϫ A

μου (2) TR D W
omit p66 p75 ℵ B BO

10:31 παλιν TR p66 ℵ B W A
omit p45 D BO

οι ιουδαιοι TR p45 p66 p75 ℵ B D A BO
omit W

10:32 αυτοις TR A
omit BO

καλα TR p45 p66 p75 ℵ B D A BO
omit W

10:33 αυτω TR A
omit BO

οι ιουδαιοι TR A
omit BO

λεγοντες TR D BO
omit p45 p66 (p75) ℵ B W A

συ TR p66 ℵ B W A
omit D

10:34 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους TR p45 p75 ℵ B W A
απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις p66 D BO

εν τω νομω υμων TR p66 p75 ℵ B D W A BO
εν τη γραφη εν τω νομω p45

10:35 ειπε TR BO
* ⲁϥⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ A

θεους TR A
ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛ ϩⲁⲛⲛⲟⲩϯ BO

προς ους ο λογος του θεου εγενετο TR p66 p75 ℵ B D W A BO omit p^{45}

η γραφη TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W BO
omit p^{45}

10:36 ου TR
ϩⲓⲉ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁ– A

λεγετε TR BO
ⲧⲉⲧ[ⲛϫⲱ ⲙ]ⲙⲁⲥ ⲁⲣⲁϥ A

10:38 ει TR A
* ⲓ̈ ... ⲉⲓⲥϫⲉ BO

πιστευητε TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
θελετε πιστευειν D

πιστευσητε TR ℵ
γινωσκητε p^{45} p^{66} p^{75} B W A BO
omit D

αυτω TR p^{45} A
τω πατρι p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W BO

10:39 παλιν TR p^{66} p^{75} B W BO
omit p^{45} ℵ D A

της χειρος TR A
ⲛⲟϥ ϫⲓϫ BO

10:40 παλιν TR p^{45} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
omit p^{66}

εις τον τοπον TR p^{45} p^{66} p^{75} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

10:41 παντα ... οσα TR
* ⲥⲉϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ A
ⲛ̣ⲏ̣ BO

ιωαννης (2) TR (p^{45}) p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A BO
omit W

10:42 και TR p^{45} p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A
ουν W

εκει TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W BO
omit (p^{45}) A

απο βηθανιας TR A
ⲛ̣ⲉ̣ϥ̣ ⲣ̣ⲉⲙⲃⲏⲑⲁⲛⲓⲁⲡⲉ BO

εκ TR BO
omit A

μαρθας TR p^{45} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
μαρας p^{66}

11:2 ην ... μαρια TR
* ⲧⲉⲉⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ A BO

11:3 αυτον TR p^{66} (p^{75}) ℵ B W A BO
τον ιησουν D

ασθενει TR p^{45} p^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
[ασθεν]ε̣ι α̣πεστειλαν ουν αι αδελφ̣[α]ι προς αυτ]ο̣ν p^{75}

κυριε TR
omit A BO

11:4 ακουσας TR A
* ⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ BO

αυτη η ασθενεια ουκ εστι. TR A
ⲡⲁⲓϣⲱⲛⲓ ⲛⲛⲟⲩϣⲱⲛⲓ ... ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ BO

υπερ της δοξης TR A BO
ⲉϥϯⲱ BO (alternate reading)

ινα TR p^{45} p^{66} p^{75} B D W A BO
αλλ ινα ℵ

ο υιος του θεου TR p^{75} ℵ B D W BO
ο υιος αυτου p^{45} p^{66} A

11:5 ηγαπα TR A BO
ⲁϥⲙⲉⲓ BO (alternate reading)

μαρθαν και την αδελφην αυτης TR BO
ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ ... ⲙⲛⲙⲁⲣⲑⲁ ⲧⲉⲥⲥⲱⲛⲉ A

11:6 TR A
omit BO

εμεινεν TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
εμεινεν ο ιησους D

εν ω ην τοπω TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A
επι τω τοπω p^{45} D
ⲙⲡⲓⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲙⲟϥ BO

11:7 επειτα TR p^{75} ℵ B W
ειτα p^{66} D BO

ΔΕ A

ΤΟΥΤΟ TR BO
omit A

ΤΟΙΣ μαθηταις TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
αυτοις P^{66}
omit P^{45}

παλιν TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W
omit ℵ A BO

11:9 απεκριθη TR A
αϥερογω... πεϫαϥ BO

ΤΟΥΤΟΥ TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D A BO
omit W

βλεπει TR BO
* ΝΕϤΝΕϒ sic A

11:10 εν αυτω TR BO
* ϨΡΗΪ ΝϨΗΤϹ sic A

11:11 ΤΟΥΤΟ TR BO
omit A

αυτοις TR BO
omit A

11:12 αυτου TR D
αυτω P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A

σωθησεται TR P^{66} ℵ B D W
εγερθησεται P^{75} A
ΝΕ<ϨϮϹ<ΙϮΝ ΟΝ BO

θανατου TR P^{75} ℵ B D W
κοιμησεως P^{66}
ЄΝΚΟΤ ΝΤЄΠЄϤΜΟϒ BO

εκεινοι TR A
ΝΘΩΟϒ BO

εδοξαν TR
* ΝΑϒΜЄϒΪ BO

κοιμησεως TR BO
ΠЄЄΙ ΝΚΑΤΚЄ A

λαζαρος TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO

λαζαρος ο φιλος ημων D

11:15 αγωμεν TR A
ⲦⲰⲞȣⲚ ⲘⲀⲢⲞⲚ BO

11:16 ειπεν TR A
* πεϫαϥ ... νωοȣ BO

ινα αποθανωμεν TR A
* ΝΤΕΝΜΟȣ BO

11:17 ελθων TR (A)
* αϥι BO

ιησους TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
ιησους εις βηθανιαν D

ηδη TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W BO
omit D A

ημερας TR BO
* omit A

11:18 ως TR
ⲙⲫⲟȣⲱϣ BO

11:19 και TR D
δε p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO

εληλυθεισαν TR A
αȣï BO

περι (1) TR (p^{45})
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

11:21 κυριε TR p^{45} p^{66} p^{75} ℵ D W A BO
omit B

11:22 αλλα TR p^{45} p^{66} D W A BO
omit p^{75} ℵ B

ο θεος TR BO F
omit A

11:25 και η ζωη TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO F
omit p^{45}

11:26 expl. και (1), 11:28 inc. και (1) F

εις εμε TR p^{45} p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A BO
omit W

11:27 αυτω TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A
omit D BO

κυριε TR P^{45} P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
κυριε πιστευω P^{66}

11:28 ταυτα TR P^{66} D A F
τουτο (P^{75}) ℵ B W BO

λαθρα TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO F
σιωπη D

11:29 ερχεται TR BO
ⲁⲥⲓ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ A

11:30 ουπω TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO F
ου D

δε TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
γαρ D F

ην TR A F
* ⲛⲁϥⲟϩⲓ BO

ην TR P^{45} D
ην ετι P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO

expl. τοπω, 11:32 inc. μαρια F

11:31 οι οντες μετ αυτης εν τη οικια και παραμυθουμενοι αυτην TR A
* ⲉⲛⲁⲩϩⲁⲧⲟⲧⲥ ϧⲉⲛⲡⲓⲏⲓ ⲉⲩⲑⲱⲧ ⲙⲡⲉⲥϩⲏⲧ BO

λεγοντες TR P^{66}
δοξ[α]ζοντες P^{75}
δοξαντες ℵ B D W BO

οτι TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
οτι ιησους ℵ

εκει TR BO
omit A

11:32 ως ηλθεν TR A F
ⲛⲧⲁⲣⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ A

ιδουσα TR P^{45} ℵ B D W
και ιδουσα P^{66} A F

επεσεν εις τους ποδας αυτου TR A F
* ⲁⲥϩⲓⲧⲥ ⲉϧⲣⲏⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲉϥϭⲁⲗⲁⲩϫ BO

αυτω TR p^{75} ℵ B D W
omit p^{66} BO

11:33 expl. κλαιοντας, 11:37 inc. ουτος (2) F

ενεβριμησατο τω πνευματι και εταραξεν εαυτον TR p^{66} (p^{75}) ℵ B W
* ⲁϥⲉϣⲧⲃⲟⲓ ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲉϥⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲉϥⲑⲉϩ BO
εταραχθη τω πνευματι ως εμβριμωμενος (p^{45}) D A

11:34 κυριε TR (p^{75}) ℵ B D W A BO
omit p^{66}

11:35 εδακρυσεν ο ιησους TR p^{66} (p^{75}) B D W (A)
και εδακρυσεν ℵ
ⲟⲩⲟϩⲉ ⲁⲛⲉⲛⲃⲁⲗ ⲛⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ϯⲉⲣⲙⲏ BO

11:36 εφιλει TR
ϥⲙⲉⲓ BO

11:37 ουκ ηδυνατο ουτος ... ποιησαι ινα και ουτος μη αποθανη TR
* ⲡⲉⲉⲓ ...[ⲛⲉⲙ]ⲛϭⲁⲙ ⲙⲙⲁϥ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲧⲙ[ⲧⲣⲉ] ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲟⲩ A
ⲙⲟⲛϣϫⲟⲙ ⲙⲫⲏ ... ⲉϣⲧⲉⲙⲭⲁⲡⲁⲓⲭⲉⲧ ⲉⲙⲟⲩ BO

11:38 εμβριμωμενος TR BO
* ⲛⲉϥ[ⲙⲁ]ⲭ ⲛϩⲏⲧ A F

σπηλαιον TR A F
ϣⲱϥ ... ϩⲉⲛⲡⲱⲛⲓ BO

λιθος επεκειτο TR (F)
* ⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛⲉ A
ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛⲓ ⲭⲏ BO

11:39 αρατε TR BO (F)
* ⲁⲗⲁϭⲉ A

η αδελφη του τεθνηκοτος TR BO F
omit A

expl. τεθνηκοτος, 11:55 inc. πασχα (2) ... εζητουν F

κυριε TR p^{75} ℵ B D W BO
omit p^{66} A

οζει TR
* ⲁϥⲣⲥⲧⲁⲉⲓ A
* ⲉⲁϥⲭⲱⲛⲥ BO

γαρ TR p^{66} ℵ B W A
omit D

11: 40 σοι TR BO
omit A

11:41 ου ην ο τεθνηκως κειμενος TR
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

δε TR
σε A

ανω TR BO
* ⲁϩⲣⲏⲓ ⲁⲧⲡⲉ A

11: 42 ηδειν TR BO
ϯⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ A

τον οχλον TR A
ⲡⲁⲓⲙⲏϣ BO

περιεστωτα TR
* ⲉⲧⲁϩⲉ ⲁⲣⲉⲧϥ A
ⲉⲧⲕⲱϯ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ BO

δευρο TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
δευρο ε̣λ̣θ̣ε̣ p^{45}

11: 44 και (1) TR (p^{45}) ℵ W
τοτε BO
και ευθυς D

ο ιησους TR
omit BO

αφετε υπαγε[illegible] TR ℵ W A
* ⲭⲁϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥϣⲉ ⲛⲁϥ BO

11:45 εκ TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

θεασαμενοι TR BO
* ⲁⲩⲛⲉⲩ A

α TR p^{45} ℵ W BO
ο B D A

ο ιησους TR ℵ D
omit p^{45} p^{66} B W A BO

τινες TR (A)
ϩⲁⲛⲕⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ BO

εξ αυτων TR A

omit BO

τους φαρισαιους TR A
ⲛⲓⲁⲣⲭⲓⲉⲣⲉⲩⲥ ⲛⲉⲙⲛⲓⲫⲁⲣⲓⲥⲥⲉⲟⲥ BO

ειπον αυτοις TR
* ⲁⲩⲧⲁ[ⲙⲁⲩ] A
ⲁⲩϫⲟⲥ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲙⲱⲟⲩ BO

α TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
ο D

11:47 συνηγαγον ... συνεδριον TR A
ⲁⲩⲓⲣⲓ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁⲛⲑⲱⲩϯ BO

οτι TR P^{66} ℵ B D W BO
omit P^{45} A

πολλα TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
τοιαυτα D

11:48 αρουσιν ημων και τον τοπον TR P^{66} ℵ B D BO
ⲛⲥⲉϥⲓ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ A
αρουσιν ημων και την πολιν W

εθνος TR
ⲅⲉⲛⲟⲥ BO

11:49 ων TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D BO
omit W

11:50 διαλογιζεσθε TR D
λογιζεσθε P^{66} ℵ B W A

υμιν TR P^{45} P^{66} B D W A
omit ℵ BO

ινα TR A
* omit BO

εις ανθρωπος TR A
* ⲩ ⲣⲱⲙⲓ BO

11:51 του ενιαυτου εκεινου TR ℵ B D W A BO
του ενιαυτου P^{66}
omit P^{45}

προεφητευσεν TR BO
* ⲉϥⲣ[ⲡⲣⲟ]ⲫⲏⲧⲉⲩⲉ A

11:52 τα διεσκορπισμενα TR (A)

ENαγϫHP BO

εν TR
* γmα A BO

11:53 απ TR BO
* ϩN' A

11:54 ουν TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A
δε P^{66}

εκειθεν TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W BO
omit (P^{45}) D A

εις (2) TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{66}

χωραν TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
χωραν σαμφουρειν D

πολιν TR ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{66}

11:55 ην εγγυς TR A
* NЄαϥϩWNT BO

εκ TR BO
* ϩN' A

και TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A
ουν D

προ του πασχα ινα αγνισωσιν εαυτους TR A
ινα αγνισωσιν εαυτους προ του πασχα BO

11:56 ελεγον TR (A) BO
* εγϫω F

τι δοκει υμιν TR P^{66} ℵ B W A
τι δοκειτε D BO F

11:57 δε TR BO (F)
γαρ A

φαρισαιοι TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
πρεσ[βυτεροι] P^{45}

εντολην TR P^{66} D A
εντολας ℵ B W BO F

expl. αρχιερεις ... εντολην, 12:2 inc. διηκονει F

εαν τις γνω TR A
* ΦΗ ΕΤΝΑΕΜΙ BO

12:1 ο τεθνηκως TR P66 D A
omit ℵ B W BO

ον ηγειρεν TR BO
· αγω α... Τ[ο]γ ΝΑC" A

νεκρων TR
νεκρων ιησους P66 ℵ B D W A BO

12:2 ουν TR ℵ B W A
και D

των TR D A F
εκ των P66 ℵ B BO

αυτω TR A
ΝΕΜΙΗ̅C̅ BO
[ϨΝ ΤΟ]γωογ ΠΕ ΜΝΙ̅C̅ F

12:3 ναρδου TR ℵ B W A BO
omit P66 D

expl. εξεμαξε, 12:46 inc. πιστευων F

ταις θριξιν αυτης TR BO
ΜΠϤωΕ ΝΤCΑΠΕ A

δε TR P66 ℵ B W A
και D

επληρωθη TR (A)
ΝΕΑϤΜΟϨ BO

εκ της οσμης TR P66(P75) ℵ B D A BO
της οσμης W

12:4 εις εκ των μαθητων αυτου TR ℵ D A
εις των μαθητων αυτου P66 B W
omit BO

σιμωνος TR
omit P66 P75 ℵ B D W A BO

μυρον TR A
omit BO

δηναριων TR
* ϹΤΑΤΕΕΡΕ A BO

12:6 ειπε TR A
* ⲉϥϫⲱ BO

περι των πτωχεν εμελεν αυτω
* ⲉϥϫⲟⲩⲫⲱ ϩⲁⲛⲓϩⲏⲕⲓ sic BO
* [ⲡ]ⲉϥⲣⲁⲟⲩϣⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲛϩⲏⲕⲉ

οτι (2) TR BO
omit A

εβαστaζεν TR A
* ⲉϥⲕⲱⲗⲡ BO

12:7 εις την ημεραν του ενταφιασμου μου τετηρηκεν αυτο TR
ινα εις την ημεραν του ενταφιασμου μου τηρηση αυτο
p^{66} (p^{75}) ℵ B D W A BO

12:8 τους . . . εχετε (2) TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W
omit D

γαρ TR p^{75} ℵ B D W
omit p^{66} A

μεθ εαυτων εμε δε ου παντοτε εχετε TR p^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
omit p^{75}

12:9 εγνω TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W BO
ηκουσαν D A

πολυς TR A
omit BO

εκ των TR p^{75} ℵ B D A BO
των p^{66} W

μονον TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

λαζαρον TR p^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
λαον p^{66}

ηγειρεν TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
ηγειρεν ιησους D

εκ νεκρων TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B D A BO
omit W

12:11 υπηγον TR p^{75} ℵ B D W A
ϣⲁⲩϣⲉ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲙⲁ BO
omit p^{66}

επιστευον TR A
ϣαυναϩϯ BO

12:13 των TR BO
αβαλ ϩν ϩεν A

εις υπαντησιν αυτω TR
* ϩιρετϥ A BO

εκραζον TR P^{75} B W A
* ευωϣ BO
εκραζον λεγοντες P^{66} ℵ D

ωσαννα TR BO
omit A

12:14 ευρων TR A
* αϥϫιμι BO

ο ιησους TR A
omit BO

ερχεται TR (A)
* εϥνηου BO

καθημενος TR A
* εϥταληου τ BO

τοτε TR P^{75} ℵ B D BO
omit P^{66} W

12:17 εμαρτυρει TR
* αϥρμντρε A BO

οτε TR ℵ B W
οτι P^{66} D A BO

εκ του μνημειου TR A
omit BO

ηγειρεν TR A
αϥϊ BO

12:18 οχλος TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
οχλος πολυς ℵ

ηκουσε TR
* αυϲωτμ A
* νεαυϲωτεμ BO

12:19 ωφελειτε TR

* ⲦⲚⲞⲚϨⲎⲨ A BO

12:20 των αναβαινοντων TR BO
ⲚⲈ Ⲧ[ⲂⲰⲔ Ⲁ]ϨⲢⲎⲒ̈ ⲀⲠ̇ϢⲀⲈⲒⲈ A

12:21 ηρωτων TR
* ⲀⲨⲤⲈⲠⲤⲰⲠ" A
* ⲈⲨⲦⲰⲂϨ BO

12:22 παλιν TR P^{66} ℵ D W
omit P^{75} B A BO

ανδρεας TR P^{66} D W A BO
ερχεται ανδρεας P^{75} ℵ B

12:23 ιησους TR BO
ⲚⲦⲀϤ A

12:24 εαν μη ... πεσων ... αποθανη TR
* ⲈⲢⲈⲤⲦⲘ ... ϨⲀⲈⲒⲈ ... ⲚⲤⲘⲞⲨ A BO

12:25 ψυχην αυτου (1) TR A
ⲦⲈϤⲮⲨⲬⲎ ϦⲈⲚⲠⲀⲒⲔⲞⲤⲘⲞⲤ BO

ο μισων TR A
ⲪⲎ ⲈⲦⲚⲀⲦⲀⲔⲞ BO

φυλαξει αυτην TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

12:26 εμοι διακονη τις TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
εμοι τις διακονη εμοι τις διακονη P^{66}

ειμι TR
ϯⲚⲀⲂⲰⲔ A BO

εκει TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A
omit D

εαν τις εμοι διακονη TR A
* ⲪⲎ ⲈⲦⲚⲀϢⲈⲘϢⲒ ⲘⲘⲞⲒ BO

12:28 σου TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ D W BO
μου B

ονομα TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
ονομα εν τη δοξη η ειχον παρα σοι προ του τον κοσμον
γενεσθαι D

ουρανου TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W A BO
ουρανου λεγουσα D

εδοξασα TR BO
ϯϯε[αγ] A

12:29 ελεγον TR (A)
omit BO

12:30 απεκριθη ο ιησους και ειπεν TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
απεκριθη ιησους ℵ

12:31 τουτου (1) TR P^{75} ℵ B
omit P^{66} D W A BO

νυν ο αρχων του κοσμου τουτου TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
και ℵ

12:33 ποιω θανατω TR BO
* ΝΕϢ ΝϨΕ A

12:34 απεκριθη αυτω TR (A)
αγεροϒω... πεϫωογ BO

μενει TR
ΟΝϦ BO

τις εστιν ουτος ο υιος του ανθρωπου TR P^{66} ℵ B D W BO (omits initially and begins next phrase; then elides this phrase and includes τις... ανθρωπου)
omit P^{75} A

12:35 ο ιησους TR A
omit BO

ετι μικρον χρονον το φως μεθ υμων εστι TR BO
* ετι κεογαειϣ ϣημπε επογαειν ϣοοπ ΝΜΜΗΤΝ A
ετι μικρον χρονον το φως εν υμων εστι P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D W

εως TR P^{66} ℵ
ως P^{75} B D W A BO

το φως εχετε TR A
* πιογωινι ΝΤΕΝΘΗΝΟΥ BO

12:36 εως TR P^{66}
ως P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO

το φως εχετε TR (A)
* πιογωινι ΝΤΕΝΘΗΝΟΥ BO

12:37 δε TR A
ουν BO

τοσαυτα ... αυτου σημεια πεποιηκοτος εμπροσθεν TR
ϧΕΝΝΙΜΗΙΝΙ ... ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΤΑϤΑΙΤΟΥ ΜΠΟΥΜΘΟ ΕΒΟΛ (A) BO

επιστευον TR ℵ B D W
επιστευσαν P^{66} BO (ΝΕΜΠΟΥΝΑϨϮ)

12:38 του προφητου TR BO
omit A

ον ειπε TR P^{66} ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{75}

και TR A
ΙΕ BO

12:39 ηδυναντο TR BO
* ΜΠΟΥϬΝϬΑΜ A

παλιν TR A
omit BO

12:40 τετυφλωκεν TR
* ΑϤΤΩΜ A BO

πεπωρωκεν TR
* ΑϤΤΩΜ A BO

επιστραφωσι TR A
ΝΤΟΥΚΟΤΟΥ ΕΡΟΙ BO

ιασωμαι TR
ΤΑΤΑΝϨΑ" A
ΝΤΑΝΑΙ BO

12:41 οτε TR D
οτι P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B BO
επει W

την δοξαν αυτου TR P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W
ΠΩΟΥ ΜΦϮ (A) BO
ΠΩΟΥΟ ΜΠϬ̅Ϲ̅ BO (alternate reading)
την δοξαν του θεου αυτου D

ελαλησε TR A
ΑϤΕΡΜΕΤΡΕ BO

12:42 ομως μεντοι TR
omit A
ΜΕΝ BO

εκ των TR P^{66} ℵ B D (A) BO

των W

γενωνται TR A
ⲚⲚⲞⲨⲀⲒⲦⲞⲨ BO

12:45 και ο θεωρων εμε θεωρει τον πεμψαντα με TR BO
omit A

12:46 εγω φως ... εληλυθα TR
* ⲁⲛⲁⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲛⲧⲁⲉⲓ A
* ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲟⲩⲱⲓⲛⲓ ⲉⲁϥⲓ BO

12:47 εαν τις ... ακουση TR (A) BO
* ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲉⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲁⲛ F

μη πιστευση TR
μη φυλαξη P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B W F
φυλαξη D (A) BO

γαρ TR BO
ⲁϩⲁ F

expl. ρηματα, 13:1 inc. εορτης F

12:48 ου ελαλησα TR A
ⲉϯⲥⲁϫⲓ ⲙⲙⲟϥ BO

12:49 αυτος TR
omit A

ειπω TR A
ϯⲛⲁⲁⲓ" BO

και TR A
ⲓⲉ BO

λαλησω TR BO
* ϯⲛⲁⲧⲉⲅⲁ" A

13:1 εληλυθεν TR ℵ B D W A BO
ηκει P^{66}

τουτου TR A
omit BO F

προς τον πατερα TR F
ⲛϥⲃⲱⲕ ϣⲁⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ A BO

13:2 ηδη TR A F
omit BO

expl. ηδη, 13:26 inc. εκεινος ... και εμβαψας F

ιουδα σιμωνος ισκαριωτου TR A
ⲥⲓⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲥⲕⲁⲣⲓⲱⲧⲏⲥ BO

13:3 ο ιησους TR A
omit P^{66} ℵ B D W BO

και (2) TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
και οτι D

13:5 ειτα TR P^{66} ℵ B W BO
ειτα λαβων D
ⲁⲩⲱ A

νιπτηρα TR ℵ B D W
ποδονιπτηρα P^{66} BO
[ⲗⲁ]ⲕⲁⲛⲏ A

μαθητων TR P^{66} ℵ B W A
μαθητων αυτου D

εκμασσειν TR A
* ⲉϥϥⲱϯ ⲙⲱⲟⲩ BO

13:6 εκεινος TR D W A
ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ BO
omit P^{66} ℵ B

κυριε TR P^{66} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

13:7 μετα ταυτα TR BO
* ⲙⲛ[ⲛⲥ]ⲱⲥ A

13:8 πετρος TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
πετρος κυριε D

ου μη νιψης TR BO
ⲛ[ⲁ]ⲕⲁⲁⲕ ⲁⲉⲓⲁ A

απεκριθη αυτω TR P^{66} ℵ B D W
απεκριθη D
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ ... ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ (A) BO

σε TR
ⲣⲉⲧⲕ A BO

13:9 λεγει TR A
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ BO

αυτω TR A
omit BO

κυριε TR P^{66} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

13:10 η τους ποδας νιψασθαι TR B W A
νιψασθαι ℵ
ει μη τους ποδας μονον νιψασθαι P^{66}
ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲛⲉϥⲫⲁⲧ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲧⲟⲩ BO
την κεφαλην νιψασθαι ει μη τους ποδας μονον D

αλλ (1) TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
γαρ D

ολος TR A
* ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲉⲑⲃⲉⲫⲁⲓ ⲁϥϫⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲛⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲁⲃ BO

και υμεις καθαροι εστε αλλα TR A
omit BO

13:11 γαρ TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
γαρ ιησους D

δια τουτο ειπεν ουχι παντες καθαροι εστε TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
omit D

13:12 οτε ... ενιψε TR BO
* [ⲛⲧⲁ]ⲣⲉϥ ⲥⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲉ![ⲟ]ⲩⲉ A

ειπεν TR BO
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲁ[ϫ]ⲉϥ A

13:14 ει ουν εγω ... και ο διδασκαλος TR P^{66} ℵ D W A BO
repeats entire phrase B

διδασκαλος TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
διδασκαλος ποσω μαλλον D

13:15 υποδειγμα γαρ ... και υμεις ποιητε TR
omit A

ινα καθως εγω εποιησα υμιν και υμεις ποιητε TR
ϩⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲓⲣⲓ ⲙⲙⲟϥ BO

13:16 μειζων TR ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{66}

13:18 η γραφη TR A
+ⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲓⲁ BO

μετ εμου τον αρτον TR P66 ℵ D W A BO
μου τον αρτον B

13:19 απ αρτι λεγω υμιν προ TR ℵ B D W A BO
omit P66

13:20 ο λαμβανων ... πεμψαντα με TR BO
omit A

13:21 ταυτα ειπων ... λεγω υμιν οτι TR BO
omit A

13:22 ουν TR P66 D W A
ουν οι ιουδαιοι ℵ
omit B
ογοζε BO

οι μαθηται TR ℵ B D W A BO
οι μαθηται αυτου P66

απορουμενοι TR
* ENCEMI AN sic BO
εγ[ρ]Μαειζε A

13:23 των TR BO
εκ των P66 ℵ B D W A

αυτου TR P66 ℵ B D
omit W BO

13:24 πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη περι ου λεγει TR P66 W BO
πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη περι ου ελεγεν και λεγει αυτω ειπε τις εστιν περι ου λεγει ℵ
πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη ουτος περι ου λεγει D
και λεγει αυτω ειπε τις εστιν περι ου λεγει B

13:25 εκεινος TR ℵ D W BO
εκεινος ουτως P66 B

13:26 αποκρινεται ο ιησους TR P66 B W (A)
αποκρινεται ο ιησους και λεγει ℵ D BO

εκεινος εστιν TR A F
omit BO

βαψας TR
* ϯΝαCαΠ' A BO

επιδωσω TR P66 ℵ D W
επιδωσω αυτω B (A) BO

εμβαψας το ψωμιον διδωσιν TR p^{66} D W A BO F
βαψας... το ψωμιον λαμβανι και διδωσιν ℵ

13:27 μετα το ψωμιον τοτε TR p^{66} ℵ B W BO
ⲘⲚⲚⲤⲀⲦⲢⲈϤϪ[Ⲓ] ⲠⲀⲈ̣ⲒⲔ A F
omit D

ουν TR p^{66} ℵ B W A
και D

13:28 ουδεις εγνω TR A F
ⲚⲈⲘⲠⲈϨⲖⲒ ⲈⲘⲒ BO

των ανακειμενων TR A BO
ϨⲚ ⲚⲈⲦⲚⲀⲨ ϨⲚ ⲦⲞⲨⲰⲞⲨ F

13:29 γαρ TR ℵ B D W BO
δε p^{66} ℵ

επει TR
* ⲈⲠⲒⲆⲈ A BO
οτι D

expl. γλωσσοκομον, 13:31. inc. λεγει F

ιουδας TR A
omit BO

ων TR BO
ⲠⲈⲦ- A

η TR BO
omit A

πτωχοις... τι δω TR
* πτωχοις... δω A
ⲚⲦⲈⲚϮ ⲚⲚⲞⲨ ⲘⲈ̣Ⲑ̣ⲚⲀⲒ ⲚⲚⲒϨⲎⲔⲒ BO

13: 22 ει ο θεος εδοξασθη εν αυτω TR
omit p^{66} ℵ B D W A BO

και ο θεος δοξασει αυτον εν εαυτω TR A F
omit BO

και ευθυς δοξασει αυτον TR p^{66} ℵ B D A BO
omit W

13:33 ετι μικρον TR BO
* ⲈⲦⲒ ⲔⲀⲒⲞⲨⲀⲈⲒϢ ϢⲎⲘ A F

οτι οπου TR B BO

οπου P^{66} ℵ D W

εγω TR ℵ B D A
omit P^{66} W

υπαγω TR BO
+ ⲘⲘⲀϤ A F

υμεις TR
omit F

αρτι TR ℵ B D W BO F
πλην αρτι P^{66}

13:34 expl. διδωμι, 14:18 inc. ερχομαι F

καθως ηγαπησα υμας ινα και υμεις αγαπατε αλληλους TR
omit BO

ηγαπησα TR ℵ B W A
εγω ηγαπησα P^{66} D

13:35 εαν αγαπην εχητε εν αλληλους TR
* ⲈϢⲠⲈ ⲞⲨⲞⲚⲀⲄⲀⲠⲎ ϨⲈⲚⲐⲎⲚⲞⲨ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ ⲈⲚⲈⲦⲈⲚⲀⲢⲎⲞⲨ BO
* ⲈⲦⲈⲦⲚϢⲀⲘⲢⲢⲈⲚⲈⲦⲚⲈⲢⲎⲨ A

13:36 απεκριθη αυτω ο ιησους TR P^{66} ℵ W A
απεκριθη ιησους B
λεγει αυτο ο ιησους D
ⲀϤⲈⲢⲞⲨⲰ ⲚϪⲈ Ⲓ̅Ⲏ̅Ⲥ̅ ⲠⲀϪⲀϤ BO

υπαγω TR P^{66} B W
εγω υπαγω ℵ D A

νυν TR BO
omit A

ακολουθησαι TR P^{66} ℵ B W BO
ακολουθησαι αρτι D

υστερον δε ακολουθησεις μοι TR
ακολοθησεις δε υστερον P^{66} ℵ B D W
ⲔⲚⲀⲘⲞϢⲒ ΔⲈ ⲈⲠϨⲀⲈ BO
omit A

13:37 ο πετρος TR P^{66} ℵ B W BO
omit D A

κυριε TR P^{66} B D W A
omit ℵ BO

σοι TR P66 ℵ B W A BO
σοι νυν D W

ακολουθησαι αρτι ; την ψυχην μου TR BO
ακολουθησαι ; αρτι την ψυχην μου A

13:38 απεκριθη αυτω ο ιησους TR
αποκρινεται ιησους P66 ℵ B W A
απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν αυτω D BO

ου μη αλεκτωρ φωνησει εως ου απαρνηση με τρις TR P66 ℵ B A
ου μη αλεκτωρ φωνησει εως ου συ με απαρνηση τρις W
ⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧϥⲙⲟⲩϯ ⲛϫⲉⲁⲗⲉⲕⲧⲱⲣ ⲕⲛⲁϫⲟⲗⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲅ ⲛⲥⲟⲡ BO

14:1 μη TR P66 ℵ B W A BO
μη και ειπεν τοις μαθηταις αυτου D

14:2 μοναι
* [ⲙⲙⲁ ⲛ]ϣⲱⲡⲉ A
* ⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲙⲧⲟⲛ BO

υμιν TR P66
υμιν οτι ℵ B D W A BO

14:3 και εαν πορευθω και ετοιμασω υμιν τοπον TR
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲓϣⲁⲃⲱ[ⲕ ⲁ]ⲥⲁⲃⲧⲉ ⲛⲟⲩ [ⲙⲁ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ] A
omit BO

παλιν TR
ⲟⲩⲟϩⲉ ... ⲟⲛ BO

14:4 εγω TR ℵ B A
omit P66 D W

οιδατε (2) TR P66 D A
omit ℵ B W BO

14:5 Θωμας TR P66 ℵ B W A BO
Θωμας ο λεγομενος D

πως δυναμεθα την οδον ειδεναι TR P66 ℵ W A
πως οιδαμεν την οδον B D BO

14:6 ει μη δι εμου TR A
ⲁⲛⲛⲉϥⲓ̈ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲧ BO

14:7 εγνωκειτε ... εγνωκειτε αν TR B BO
εγνωκατε ... γνωσεσθε P66 ℵ D W A

γινωσκετε TR A
ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ" BO

εωρακατε αυτον TR p^{66} ℵ D W
εωρακατε B
ⲦⲈⲦⲚⲚⲈⲨ ⲀⲢⲀϤ A
omit BO

14:8 κυριε TR A
omit BO

αρκει TR
* ⲚⲔϨⲰ (conjunctive following imperative) A BO

14:9 εγνωκας TR A
* ⲘⲠⲈⲔⲚⲀⲨ BO

τον πατερα (1) TR BO
* ⲠⲀⲔⲈⲈⲒⲰⲦ A

14:10 ου πιστευεις οτι TR BO
ⲚⲔⲠⲒⲤⲦⲈⲨⲈ ⲚⲎⲈⲒ ⲉ̣[Ⲛ ϪⲈ] A

λαλω (1) TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ D W BO
omit B

ο εν εμοι μενων TR ℵ D W A
εν εμοι μενων p^{66} p^{75} B BO

αυτος TR p^{75} W
αυτου p^{66} ℵ B D A

14:11 δια TR p^{66} p^{75} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

τα εργα αυτα TR p^{66} ℵ D W
τα εργα αυτου p^{75} B A
ⲚⲀϨⲂⲎⲞⲨⲒ BO

μοι (2) TR B
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ D W A BO

14:12 εγω (1) TR
omit A

εκεινος (κακεινος) TR A
omit BO

τουτων TR p^{75} ℵ B D W
ⲀⲢⲀⲨ A BO
omit p^{66}

μου TR D
omit p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W BO

14:13 τουτο TR A
omit BO

14:14 εαν ... αιτησητε TR A
* ΦΗ ΕΤΕΤΕΝΝΑΕΡΕϪΙΝ ΜΟϤ BO

εγω ποιησω TR P^{66} ℵ D W BO
τουτο ποιησω P^{75} B A

14:15 με TR P^{66} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

τηρησατε TR A
* ΤΕΤΕΝΑΡΕϨ sic BO

14:16 ερωτησω TR P^{66} P^{75} B D W A BO
τηρησω ℵ

αλλον TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A
αλλα P^{66}
omit BO

14:19 ετι (2) TR
omit A BO

υμεις δε θεωρειτε με TR BO F
omit A

14:20 οτι TR P^{75} ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{66}

expl. υμεις (2), 14:23 inc. απεκριθη F

και υμεις εν εμοι TR BO
και υμεις εν εμοι και υμεις εν εμοι A

14:21 ο εχων τας εντολας μου TR
* ΦΗ ΕΤΕΝΑΕΝΤΟΛΗ ΝΤΟΤϤ BO
ΠΕΤΕγΝΤΕϤ ΝϮ[ΕΝΤΟΛΗ] A

αγαπηθησεται υπο του πατρος μου TR P^{66} ℵ B D W BO
τηρηθησεται υπο του πατρος μου P^{75}
ΠΑΕΙⲰΤ ΝΑΜΡΡΙΤϤ A

14:22 αυτω TR BO
omit A

ουχ ο ισκαριωτης TR BO
Π ΚΑΝΑΝ[Ι]ΤΗϹ A

τι γεγονεν οτι TR BO

ⲦⲒ   A

ουχι   τω κοσμω   TR
ⲘⲠⲒⲔⲞⲤⲘⲞⲤ   ⲦⲎⲢϤ ⲀⲚ   BO
ⲈⲔⲚⲀⲞⲨⲀⲚⲈϨⲔ   ⲚⲦⲀϤ ⲈⲚ ⲀⲂⲀⲖ   ⲘⲠⲔⲞⲤⲘⲞⲤ   A

14:23 εαν τις αγαπα   TR A F
* ⲪⲎ ⲈⲦⲘⲈⲒ   BO

τηρησει   TR A BO
ⲚϤⲀⲢⲈϨ (conjunctive following conditional) F

ελευσομεθα   TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W   BO
ελευσομαι   D A

μονην   TR
* ⲞⲨⲘⲀ ⲚϢⲰⲠⲈ   A BO

ποιησομεν   TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W
ⲚⲦⲈⲚⲬⲰ... ⲚⲀⲚ   BO
ποιησομαι   D
ⲚⲦⲀⲦⲈⲚⲞ   ⲚⲈⲚ   A

14:24 τηρει   TR A
ⲘⲠⲈϤⲀⲢⲈϨ   BO

τους λογους μου   TR
ⲠⲀⲤⲈϪⲈ   A BO F

expl. λογους μου, 15:4 inc. εν εμοι [μεινητε]   F

ο λογος   TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B W A BO
ο λογος ο εμος   D

14:25 ταυτα λελαληκα   TR BO
Ⲛ̣Ⲉ̣[ⲈⲒ] ⲈⲈⲒϢⲀϪⲞⲞⲨ   A

14:26 πατηρ   TR p^{66} p^{75} ℵ B A BO
πατηρ μου   D

παντα   TR BO
[Ⲉ]ϪⲈ ⲚⲒⲘ   A

ειπον   TR p^{66} ℵ B   BO
ειπω   D A

υμιν   TR ℵ D A
υμιν εγω   B

14:27 ου καθως ο κοσμος διδωσιν εγω διδωμι υμιν   TR
omit   A

δίδωσιν TR BD BO
δίδωσιν υμιν ℵ

14:28 ερχομαι TR
παλι ON ϯΝαι BO

ειπον (2) TR D
omit ℵ B A BO

μου (1) TR ℵ D
omit B BO

14:30 ετι TR A
omit BO

πολλα TR
ϩαϩ ... ΝCΕϪΕ A BO

τουτου TR A BO
omit ℵ B D

εχει TR ℵ B
ϥΝαϪΕΜ A BO
ΕΧΕΙ ... ευρειν D

14:31 ενετειλατο TR ℵ D A (ΝΤαϥταΤΟΟΤ)
εντολην εδωκεν B BO

ο πατηρ TR ℵ B BO
omit D A

15:2 αιρει TR BO
ϥΝαϣααΤ" A

παν (2) TR BO
ϣλϩ ΝΙΜ A

15:3 ηδη ... υμιν TR ℵ B A BO
omit D

ηδη ... καθαροι εστε TR BO
* ατετΝΤΟϳΒΟ A

υμιν TR ℵ B D A
εν υμειν p^{66} BO

15:4 μεινατε ... φερειν TR p^{66} ℵ B A BO
omit D

καγω εν υμιν TR A
ΝΤαΟϩΙ ϧΕΝΘΗΝΟϳ BO

εαν μη εν εμοι μεινητε TR ℵ B D BO
[ο ε]ν εμοι μενων P66

15:5 εγω TR P66 ℵ B A
εγω γαρ D

εν εμοι TR A
omit BO

καγω εν αυτω TR A F
ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ϩⲱ ϯⲛⲁⲟϩⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ BO

ουδεν TR (P66) ℵ B (A) BO (F)
omit D

15:6 expl. εβληθη, 15:9 inc. ηγαπησε ... ο πατηρ F

κλημα TR A
ⲕⲗⲏⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲟⲛⲧϥ ⲟⲩⲧⲁϩ BO

αυτα TR B A
αυτο ℵ D BO

15:7 εαν TR ℵ D A BO
εαν μη B

αιτησεσθε TR ℵ
αιτησασθε B D A BO

γενησεται TR BO
* ⲛϥϣⲱⲡⲉ A

υμιν (2) TR ℵ B A BO
omit P66 D

15:8 πολυν TR A
* ϩⲏⲛⲓ sic BO

15:10 εαν τας εντολας μου τηρησητε μενειτε εν τη αγαπη μου TR B D A
τηρησηται μενειται εν τη αγαπη P66
omit ℵ BO

εγω TR A
omit F

τας εντολας TR P66 B D A BO
τας εντολας μου ℵ

αυτου εν τη αγαπη TR
ϩⲛⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ A

15:11 υμιν TR A
ⲚⲈⲘⲰⲦⲈⲚ BO

ινα η χαρα η εμη εν υμιν μεινη και η χαρα υμων πληρωθη TR BO
omit A

expl. η χαρα η εμη F

15:12 αυτη εστιν η εντολη η εμη TR BO
omit A

15:13 τις TR ℵ B D BO
omit P66 A

αυτου (1) TR
omit BO

δη TR A
+ BO

15:14 υμεις φιλοι μου εστε TR BO
omit A

οσα TR P66 ℵ D A
ο B BO

15:15 ουκ οιδε TR ℵ B D A
* ⲘⲠⲈⲢⲈ ... ⲈⲘⲒ BO

15:16 και εθηκα υμας TR BO
omit A

μενη TR
ⲚⲦⲈϤϢⲰⲠⲒ ⲈϤⲤⲘⲞⲚⲦ BO
ⲈⲢⲈ... ⲚⲀⲘⲞⲨⲚ ⲀⲂⲀⲖ ϢⲀ ⲀⲚⲎϨⲈ A

ινα (2) TR P66 B D A BO
omit ℵ

τον πατερα TR A
omit BO

15:18 μισει TR ℵ B D A BO
εμισει σε P66

γινωσκετε TR A BO (imperative)

υμων TR P66 B A BO
omit ℵ D

15:19 ΟΤΙ TR A
ΟΤΙ ΜΟΝ ϫϵ BO

ουκ TR P66 ℵ B A BO
omit D

του κοσμου TR ℵ B D A BO
του τουτου κοσμου P66

15:20 του λογου ου TR P66 ℵ B A BO
τους λογους ους D

εγω TR P66 B D
omit ℵ A

υμιν TR P66 B D A BO
υμας ℵ

εστι TR P66 ℵ B A BO
εστι μου D

15:21 παντα TR P66 ℵ B A BO
omit D

υμιν TR A
εις υμας P66 B D BO
omit ℵ

15:22 δε TR BO
ουν A

15:24 α ουδεις αλλος πεποιηκεν TR A
* ϵΜΟΝϣϫΟΜ ΝΤϵΚϵΟγαι αΙΤΟγ BO

15:25 νομω TR B D A BO
κοσμω ℵ

15:26 ελθη TR BO
* ϵγϣαϵι sic A

εγω TR
omit A

16:1 μη TR B D A BO
omit ℵ

16:1,2 ινα μη σκανδαλισθητε αποσυναγωγους ποιησουσιν υμας TR B D
ινα σκανδαλισθητε αποσυναγωγους γαρ ποιησωσιν υμας ℵ
ϫϵκαcϵ ΝϵΤΝΡCΚαΝΔαλΙΖϵ ΝCϵΡΤΗΝϵ ΝαΠΟCγΝαΓωΓΟC A
ϩΙΝα ϫϵΝΝϵΤϵΝϵΡCΚαΝ ΔαλΙCΖϵCΘϵ ϫϵαγϵΡΘΗΝΟγ ΝΝαΠΟCγΝαΓωΓΟC BO

ινα πας . . . δοξη TR A
ϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲉⲩⲙⲉⲩⲓ BO

λατρειαν προσφερειν TR
* ⲉϥⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲙϣⲉ A
* ⲁⲩⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲛⲟⲩϣⲟⲩϣⲱⲟⲩϣⲓ ⲉⲡϣⲱⲓ BO

16:3 υμιν TR ℵ D A BO
omit B

ουδε εμε TR
ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩⲱⲱⲛⲧ A BO

16:4 αλλα TR BO
omit A

ταυτα TR A
ⲙⲙⲱⲟⲩ BO

αυτων TR ℵ B A BO
omit D

ειπον (1) TR A
ⲁⲓⲉⲣϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲛϫⲟⲧ" BO

ειπον (2) TR BO
ⲙⲡⲟⲩϫⲟ" sic A

16:5 υπαγω TR B D A
εγω υπαγω ℵ

υπαγεις TR B D A BO
υπαγει ℵ

16:7 αλλ TR BO
omit A

λεγω TR BO
ⲁ̣[ⲉⲓϫⲱ] A

υμας (1) TR B D A BO
ημας ℵ

εαν δε πορευθω πεμψω αυτον προς υμας TR ℵ B D W A BO
omit P66

16:8 εκεινος TR A
omit BO

16:9 μεν TR A
omit BO

ου TR BDW A BO
omit ℵ

πιστευουσιν TR A
ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲛⲁϩϯ BO

16:10 ετι TR BO
omit A

16:11 κεκριται TR A BO
ⲥⲉⲛⲁϩⲓⲧϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ BO (alternate reading)

16:12 πολλα TR BO
ϩⲁϩ ⲛⲥⲉϫⲉ A

δυνασθε TR ℵBW A
δυνασθε αυτα D BO

αρτι TR (P^{66}) BDW BO
Omit ℵ A

16:13 εκεινος TR A
omit BO

της αληθειας TR BO
omit A

αληθειας TR ℵBW A BO
αληθειας εκεινος D

πασαν TR BDW A
omit ℵ BO

οσα αν ακουση TR BO
ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲥⲁⲧⲙϥ A

D λαλησει TR A
ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧϥⲛⲁⲥⲁϫⲓ ⲙⲙⲱⲟⲩ BO

τα ερχομενα TR BO
* ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ A

αναγγελει υμιν TR A
* ⲛⲧⲉϥⲥⲁϫⲓ ⲙⲙⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲙⲱⲧⲉⲛ BO

16:15 omit entire verse P^{66} ℵ

ειπον TR BO
ειπον υμιν A

16:16 μικρον και ου θεωρειτε TR

μικρον και ουκετι θεωρειτε (P^{66}) ℵ B D W
ⲉⲧⲓ ⲕⲉⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩ ... ⲁⲛ BO
* ⲕⲁⲓ ϣⲏⲙⲡⲉ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ[ⲗⲟ] ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲛⲉⲩ A

παλιν TR
omit A
ⲉⲧⲓ BO

οψεσθε TR BO
* ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛⲛⲉⲩ (conjunctive after present) A

οτι εγω υπαγω προς τον πατερα TR BO
omit P^{66} ℵ B D W A

16:17 εκ των TR BO
ϩⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ' A

ο λεγει TR A
* ⲉⲧⲁϥϫⲟϥ BO

μικρον και ου θεωρειτε με και παλιν TR (P^{66}) B
μικρον και ουκετι θεωριται με και παλιν W
μεικρον και ουκετι οψεσθε με και παλιν D
omit ℵ
ⲉⲧⲓ ⲕⲁⲓ ϣⲏ[ⲙ]ⲡⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛⲧⲙⲛⲉⲩ ⲁⲣⲁⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲕⲁⲓ A
ⲉⲧⲓ ⲕⲉⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲓ BO

οψεσθε TR BO
* ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛⲛⲉⲩ A

οτι TR B D
omit ℵ W A BO

εγω TR D W A
omit ℵ B

16:18 ελεγον ... ο λεγει TR A BO
omit D

ουν TR
ⲁⲩⲱ A

ο λεγει TR B A
omit P^{66} ℵ W BO

τι λαλει TR P^{66} ℵ W A BO
omit B

16:19 ηθελον TR B D
ημελλον ℵ W A BO
ημελλον και ηθελον P^{66}

ερωταν TR ℵ B W A BO
ερωταν περι τουτου D

περι τουτου TR BO
ΕΤΒΕ ΕΥ A

ου θεωρειτε TR BO
* ΤΕΤΝΛΟ ΕΤΕΤΝΝΕΥ A

παλιν μικρον TR
ΚΑΙ ϢΗΜΠΕ A
ΕΤΙ ΚΟΥΙ BO

οψεσθε TR BO
* ΝΤΕΤΝΝΕΥ A

16:20 θρηνησετε TR
ΝΤΕΤΝΤΑΕΙΤΕ ΝΤΕΤΝΑϢΑϨΑΜ A BO

δε (2)
ΜΕΝ BO

γενησεται TR
* ΝΑϢΩΠΕ ΝΗΤΝ A BO

16:21 οταν τικτη TR
* ΕϹΙ ΕϹΝΑΜΙϹΕ A
* ΑϹϢΑΝΟΥΙ ΕΜΙϹΕ BO

ωρα TR ℵ B W BO (ΕΤΕϹΟΥΝΟΥ)
ημερα P^{66} D A

παιδιον TR BO (ΑΛΟΥ)
* ϢΗΡΗ A

θλιψεως TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
λυπης D

εγεννηθη ανθρωπος TR A
ΑϹΜΙϹΙ ΝΝΟΥΑΛΟΥ BO

16:22 μεν νυν TR A
omit BO

λυπην TR A
* ΟΥΜΚΑϨ ΝϨΗΤ BO

παλιν TR BO
ΜΝ[Ν]ϹΩϹ ... ΑΝ A

χαρησεται TR A

* ⲈϤⲢⲀϢⲒ BO

16:23 ουδεν TR BO
omit A

αιτησητε TR
ⲦⲈⲦⲈⲚⲚⲀⲈⲢⲈϪⲒⲚ... ⲈⲐⲂⲎⲦϤ BO

16:24 ουκ ητησατε
* ⲘⲠⲀⲦⲈⲦⲚⲢⲀⲒⲦⲒ A BO

ουδεν TR (A)
ⲈⲐⲂⲈϨⲖⲒ BO

16:25 παροιμιας TR A
* ⲒⲚⲒ BO

αλλ TR A
omit BO

ωρα TR ℵ B D W A BO
omit P66

ετι TR A
omit BO

υμιν (2) TR
ⲚⲘⲘⲎⲦⲚ A BO

παρρησια TR A
ⲒⲚⲒ BO

αναγγελω TR ℵ B D W
* ⲈⲒⲦⲀⲘⲞ BO
λαλησω P66 A

16:26 πατερα TR ℵ B W BO
πατερα μου D

λεγω TR BO
ϯⲚⲀϪⲞⲞⲤ A

περι υμων TR ℵ B D W BO
omit P66 A

16:27 εμε TR BO
-Ϥ A

εξηλθον TR BO
* ⲈⲈⲒⲚⲚⲎⲨ A

θεου TR ℵ D W
πατρος B A BO

16:28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος TR ℵ B D
omit W A BO

αυτω TR ℵ D W A BO
omit B

16:29 παροιμιαν TR A
* ⲓⲛⲓ BO

16:30 οιδαμεν TR BO
ⲁⲛⲙⲙⲉ A

16:31 απεκριθη αυτοις TR (A)
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ BO

16:32 ιδου TR ℵ ~~B D W~~ A BO
omit P66

νυν TR
omit P66 ℵ B D W A BO

εληλυθεν TR P66 B D W
εληλυθεν η ωρα ℵ
ⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱ ⲉⲥⲓ BO

εκαστος TR A
* ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲉⲛ BO

τα ιδια TR BO
ⲁ[ⲡⲉ]ϥⲙⲁ A

και (2) TR
αλλα A BO

ειμι TR A
* ϯⲭⲏ BO

οτι TR A
omit BO

εστι TR A
* ϥⲭⲏ BO

16:33 εν τω κοσμω θλιψιν εξετε TR ℵ B D W A BO
omit P66

17:1 ο ιησους TR A
omit BO

σου (2) TR D
omit ℵBW BO

17:2 αυτω (2) TR BO
ΝΗΕΙ A

δωση TR
ΕΙΑϯ A
ΝΤΕΚϯ BO

αυτοις TR B A BO
αυτω ℵ W
omit D

17:3 σε TR ℵ B D A BO
omit W

χριστον TR P66 ℵ B W A BO
χριστον εις τουτον τον κοσμον D

17:4 εργον TR P66 ℵ B D A BO
εργον σου W

17:5 και TR
σε A

σου TR
omit A

παρα σεαυτω TR A
omit BO

17:6 λογον σου TR A
ΠΑCΑϪΙ BO

τετηρηκασι TR BO
ΑΕΙΑΡΗϨ A

17:7 εγνωκαν TR B D
εγνων ℵ W A BO

παντα TR A
omit BO

παρα σου εστιν TR A
ΝΕΝΟϤΚΝΕ BO

17:8 ρηματα TR ℵ B W A BO
ρηματα σου D

και εγνωσαν TR B

omit ℵ D W A BO

επιστευσαν TR A
ⲁⲩⲛⲁϩϯ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ BO

17:10 και τα εμα παντα σα εστι και τα σα εμα TR(P^{66}) B D W A BO
και εμοι αυτους εδωκας ℵ

δεδοξασμαι TR B W A BO
εδοξασας με P^{66} ℵ D

17:11 ετι TR A
omit BO

εν τω κοσμω (1) TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
εν τουτω κοσμω D

και (2) TR
ⲇⲉ A

ουτοι TR
ⲛⲧⲁⲩ A
ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲑⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲓ BO

εισι TR A
* ⲥⲉⲭⲏ BO

ερχομαι TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
ερχομαι ουκ ετι ειμι εν τω κοσμω και εν τω κοσμω ειμι D

σου TR (P^{66}) ℵ B W A BO
σου και οτε ημην μετ αυτων εγω ετηρουν αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου D

ους δεδωκας μοι TR
ω δεδωκας μοι P^{66} ℵ B D W BO
omit A

17:12 οτε ημην μετ' αυτων TR
* ϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲉⲓϣⲟⲡ ⲛⲉⲙⲱⲟⲩ BO
* ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓϣ ⲉⲉⲓⲛⲙⲙⲉⲩ A

εν τω κοσμω TR
omit P^{66} ℵ B D W A BO

σου TR ℵ B W A BO
μου P^{66}

ους δεδωκας μοι TR D
ο δεδωκας μοι (P^{66}) B W A BO
omit ℵ

εφυλαξα TR D
εφυλασσον ℵ
και εφυλαξα B W A BO

εξ TR ℵ B D W A BO
omit P^{66}

απωλετο TR BO
NαTEKO A

17:13 εν (1) TR P^{66} ℵ B W A
εν τουτω D
ειχη ζεν BO

εν αυτοις TR
omit BO

17:14 αυτοις TR(P^{66}) ℵ B W A BO
εν αυτοις D

εμισησεν TR ℵ B W A BO
μεισει D

εκ (1) TR P^{66} ℵ B A BO
εκ τουτου D

καθως ... του κοσμου TR ℵ B W A BO
omit P^{66} D

17:15 εκ του κοσμου ... τηρησης αυτους TR P^{66} ℵ D W A BO
omit B

17:16 εκ (1) TR (P^{66}) ℵ B W A BO
εκ τουτου D

17:17 σου TR
omit P^{66} ℵ B D W A BO

ο λογος ο σος αληθεια εστι TR P^{66} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

17:18 εις (1) TR ℵ B W A BO
εις τουτον D

καγω απεστειλα αυτους εις τον κοσμον TR ℵ W A BO
entire phrase repeated B
omit P^{66}
καγω ... εις τουτον τον κοσμον D

17:19 εγω TR B D
omit ℵ W A

17:20 περι των πιστευσοντων TR BO
ετβε Νκαγε ϩΝ ετΝαρπιcτεγε A

17:21 ἕν (2) TR ℵ
omit BDW A BO

17:22 εγω TR (καγω)
omit A

δοξαν TR P^{66} ℵBD BO
δοξαν μου W

ινα ωσιν ... εσμεν TR BO
omit A

εν εσμεν TR D BO
εν P^{66} BW
omit ℵ

17:23 omit entire verse A

εις εν TR
* εγοι ΝΝΟγαι BO

ινα (2) TR BD
omit ℵW BO

ηγαπησας (1) TR ℵBW BO
ηγαπησα D

17:24 πατηρ ... εδωκας μοι TR
omit A

ους TR BO
ο ℵBDW

την εμην TR ℵBW
omit D BO

17:25 κοσμος TR ℵBW A BO
κοσμος τουτος D

εγνωσαν TR BO
αγcογωωΝΤ A

εγνων TR A
+cωογΝ BO

17:26 και (2) TR
αγω αΝ A

γνωρισω TR
* ϯⲛⲁⲟⲩⲁⲛⲉϩϥ A
* ϯⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲁⲙⲱⲟⲩ BO

με TR BDW A BO
αυτους ℵ

καγω εν αυτοις TR BO
omit A

18:1 των κεδρων TR BD
του κεδρου ℵW A BO

αυτος TR
omit A

18:2 ιουδας TR ℵBDW A BO
omit (P⁶⁶)

τον τοπον TR
ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲉⲩ A BO

18:3 και (2) TR BDW A BO
και εκ ℵ

εκει TR BDW BO
omit ℵ
* ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲉⲩ A

18:4 ειδως TR A
* ⲛⲁϥⲥⲱⲟⲩⲛ BO

τα ερχομενα επ αυτον TR A
ⲉⲧⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲙⲙⲟϥ BO

18:5 απεκριθησαν αυτω TR
ⲡⲉϫⲉⲩ BO
ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ ⲛⲉϥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲛϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲥⲁ' A

ο ιησους TR ℵBW A
omit D BO

μετ αυτων TR BO
omit A

18:6 αυτοις TR BDW A BO
omit ℵ

απηλθον εις τα οπισω και επεσον χαμαι TR BO
ⲁⲩϩⲁⲉⲓⲉ ⲥⲁⲡⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲁϩⲣⲏⲓ̈ ⲁϫⲛⲡⲕⲁϩ A

αυτους επηρωτησε TR ℵ B W
αυτους επηρωτησε αυτους επηρωτησε BO
αυτους επηρωτησε λεγων D A

ειπον TR ℵ B W A BO
ειπον παλιν D

18:8 απεκριθη TR ℵ B W A
απεκριθη αυτοις D
αϥεροȣω ... πεϫαϥ Νωοȣ BO

εμε ζητειτε TR A
* αρετενι εθβητ BO

αφετε τουτους υπαγειν TR A
* χεναι εβολ μαροȣϣε Νωοȣ BO

18:9 μοι TR A
omit BO

18:10 ουν TR ℵ B W A
τοτε D

εχων TR A
* ΝεοȣοΝ BO

μαχαιραν TR
CΗϥε ΝΤΟΟΤϥ A BO

απεκοψεν TR BO
* αϥϥι A

δουλω TR P^{66} ℵ B W A BO
δουλω εκεινου D

18:11 σου TR D
omit P^{66} ℵ B W BO

18:13 γαρ TR BO
Δε A

ος ην TR BO
omit A

εκεινου TR ℵ B W A BO
omit (P^{66})

απολεσθαι TR
αποθανειν ℵ B W A BO

ενα ανθρωπον TR A

* ⲩⲣⲱⲙⲓ BO

18:15 ο αλλος TR A
αλλος P66 ℵ B W BO

ο δε μαθητης εκεινος TR ℵ B W A BO
εκεινος (P66)

ην γνωστος τω αρχιερει TR ℵ B W BO
omit P66
* ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲡⲁⲣ[ϫⲓⲉ]ⲣⲉⲩⲥ ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ ⲙⲙⲁϥ A

συνεισηλθε TR A
ⲁϥⲉⲣϣⲫⲉⲣ ⲛⲛⲓ ⲉϧⲟⲩⲛ BO (ed. : doubtful reading)

18:16 ο αλλος TR ℵ B W
omit (P66) A BO

ος ην γνωστος τω αρχιερει TR P66 ℵ W BO
ο γνωστος του αρχιερεως B
* ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲁⲣϫⲓⲉⲣⲉⲩⲥ ⲥ̣[ⲁⲩⲛⲉ ⲙ]ⲙⲁϥ A

ειπε TR
ⲁϥⲥⲁϫⲓ BO

και (2)
ⲧⲟⲧⲉ BO

18:17 η θυρωρος TR A
omit BO

λεγει εκεινος TR
λεγει A
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ BO

ουκ ειμι TR
* ⲙⲙⲁⲛ A BO

18:18 ειστηκεισαν δε TR A
ⲛⲁⲩⲟϩⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ BO

ανθρακιαν πεποιηκοτες TR BO
* ⲉⲁⲩϫⲉⲣⲉⲟⲩϣ̣[ⲁϩ] A

ψυχος ην TR
* ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲡϫⲉϥ ⲙⲡⲁⲗ A BO

εθερμαινοντο TR BO
* ⲉⲩⲧϩⲙⲙⲟ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ A

μετ αυτων TR

omit A BO

εστως TR ℵ B A BO
omit P66 W

18:19 ηρωτησε TR A
* ⲛⲁϥϣⲓⲛⲓ BO

αυτου (2) TR BO
omit A

18:20 εδιδαξα TR
* ⲉⲉⲓϯⲥⲃⲱ A
* ⲛⲁⲓϯⲥⲃⲱ BO

παντοτε (2) TR
παντες ℵ B W A BO

ελαλησα ουδεν TR
ⲙⲡⲓϫⲉⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲛⲥⲉϫⲉ A BO

18:21 τι ελαλησα TR BO
ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲉⲓϫⲟⲟⲩ A

ιδε TR BO
omit A

α ειπον TR A
ⲛⲛⲏ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲁⲓϫⲟⲧⲟⲩ BO

18:22 παρεστηκως TR BO
omit A

εδωκε ραπισμα TR BO
* ⲁϥϣⲱⲥⲉ A

ουτως αποκρινη τω αρχιερει TR BO
ⲧⲉⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲁϣⲃ ⲡⲁⲣ[ϫⲓ]ⲉⲣⲉⲩⲥ A

18:23 απεκριθη TR B
ειπεν ℵ W A BO

αυτω TR
omit A BO

ελαλησα TR B A BO
ειπον ℵ W

18:25 εκεινος και ειπεν TR A
omit BO

ουκ ειμι TR
* ⲘⲘⲀⲚ A BO

18:26 ουκ εγω σε ειδον TR
εγω σε ειδον BO
ⲀⲚⲀⲚ ⲈⲢⲚⲈⲦ ⲀⲢⲀⲔ A

18:27 ο πετρος TR BO
omit A

18:28 ουν TR
ⲘⲚⲚⲤⲀⲚⲈⲈⲒ A BO

ινα TR
omit ℵ B W A

18:29 ειπε TR A
ⲠⲈϪⲀϤ ⲚⲰⲞⲨ BO

κατα του ανθρωπου TR BO
ⲀϨⲞⲨⲚ ⲀⲠⲈⲈⲒⲘⲀ A

18:30 αυτω TR A
omit BO

ει μη ην ουτος κακοποιος TR
ει μη ην ουτος κακον ποιησας ℵ A BO (ⲈⲚⲈⲘⲠⲈⲠⲈⲈⲒ ⲢⲠⲈⲐⲀⲨ)
ει μη ην ουτος κακον ποιων B W

18:31 εξεστι TR A
* ⲘⲠⲈⲤϢⲈ BO

ουδενα TR p66 B W A BO
ουδενα ιουδενα ℵ

18:32 λογος του ιησου πληρωθη ον ειπε TR B W A
λογος του ιησου πληρωθη ℵ
* ⲚⲦⲈϤϪⲰⲔ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲚϪⲈⲠⲤⲀϪⲒ ⲈⲦⲀϤϪⲞϤ ⲚϪⲈⲒⲎ̅Ⲥ̅ BO

18:34 απεκριθη αυτω ο ιησους TR ℵ
απεκριθη ο ιησους p66 B W A
ⲀϤⲈⲢⲞⲨⲰ ⲚϪⲈⲒⲎ̅Ⲥ̅ ⲠⲈϪⲀϤ ⲚⲀϤ BO

συ TR B W
omit p66 ℵ A

λεγεις TR p66 B W A BO
ειπας ℵ

18:35 απεκριθη TR A
ⲀϤⲈⲢⲞⲨⲰ... ⲠⲈϪⲀϤ BO

μητι TR B A
[μη] γαρ P66
μη ℵ W BO

18:36 απεκριθη TR A
αϥερογω . . . πεϫαϥ BO

αν . . . εμοι ηγωνιζοντο TR A
ναρε . . . ναϯ εϫωι BO

εντευθεν TR A
ϧενπαικοcμοc BO

18:37 βασιλευς ειμι εγω TR
αΝΟΚ BO
ΝΤΚΟγρρο A

εγω . . . γεγεννημαι TR A
* αΝΟΚ ογΜΙCΙ sic BO

εις τουτο TR ℵ B W A
* εθβεφαι BO

τη αληθεια TR P66 B W A BO
περι της αληθιας ℵ

εκ της TR P66 B W A BO
της ℵ

18:38 παλιν TR A
omit BO

18:40 παλιν TR
omit A BO

παντες λεγοντες TR BO
λεγοντες ℵ B W
omit P66 A

ην . . . βαρραβαν TR A
* εβαραββαΝ BO

19:2 επεθηκαν TR P66 B W A BO
επεθηκεν ℵ

19:3 ελεγον TR
ηρχοντο προς αυτον και ελεγον P66 ℵ B W A
ηρχοντο προς αυτον και ελεγον αυτω BO

εδιδουν TR BO
* εϭ[ϯ] A

αυτω ραπισματα TR BO
[αα]c αϩογν ϩνπεϥϩο A

19:4 παλιν TR P^{66} ℵ B A BO
omit W

εξω TR BO
αβαλ ϣα αραγ A

αγω TR
* αειντ" A
ϯναινι BO

εν αυτω TR B W A BO
omit ℵ

19:5 - 19:20 extremely fragmentary in A

19:5 φορων τον ακανθινον στεφανον και το πορφυρουν ιματιον TR
* [εφ]επκλαμ νϣαντε ϩι[ϫντϥαπε α]γω ερετϩαειτε ν[ϫησε ϩιωω]ϥ A
* επιχλομ τοι εϫωϥ νcογρι εϥερφοριν μπιϩβοc νϫηϫι BO

και λεγει αυτοις ΙΣ ο ανθρωπος TR ℵ B W BO
omit P^{66} A

19:6 οι αρχιερεις και οι υπηρεται TR BO
οι υπηρεται και οι αρχιερεις A

σταυρωσον σταυρωσον TR A
* αϣϥ αϣϥ BO

19:7 αυτω TR B
omit P^{66} ℵ W A BO

οφειλει αποθανειν TR (A)
* ϥεμπϣα μφμογ BO

19:8 μαλλον TR
omit BO

19:9 παλιν TR B W
omit ℵ BO

19:10 εμοι ου λαλεις TR (A)
εθβεογ νκcαϫι νεμηι αν BO

εξουσιαν εχω σταυρωσα σε και εξουσιαν εχω απολυσαι
σε TR W (A) BO (αϣ for σταυρωσα)
εξουσιαν εχω απολυσαι σε και εξουσιαν εχω σταυρωσαι σε ℵ B

19:11 απεκριθη ο ιησους TR (P^{66})

απεκριθη αυτω ο ιησους ℵBDW
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ ⲛϫⲉⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ BO

ειχες TR BW
εχις ℵ BO

ο παραδιδους TR
ο παραδους ℵB BO

19:12 εκραζον λεγοντες TR BW (A)
ελεγον ℵ
ⲛⲁⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ BO

πας ο βασιλεα ... τω καισαρι TR BO
omit A

19:13 εις τοπον λεγομενον TR ℵBW BO
τοπον λεγομενον A
omit (p66)

λιθοστρωτον TR A
* ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧⲫⲟⲣϣ ⲛⲛⲱⲛⲓ BO

γαββαθα TR BW BO
γολγοθα ℵ

19:14 ην δε παρασκευη του πασχα ωρα δε ωσει εκτη TR ℵBW BO
[ⲛⲉ]ⲡ̣ ⲛ[ⲉ]ⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲛϫⲡ[ⲥⲟⲉ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲧⲡ]ⲁ̣ⲣⲁ̣[ⲥ]ⲕⲉⲩⲏ ⲙⲡⲡ[ⲁⲥⲭⲁ] A

19:15 εκραυγασαν TR p66 B BO
* ⲛⲉⲩⲁϣⲥⲏⲗ A
ελεγον ℵ W

αρον αρον TR
ϥⲓ[ⲧϥ ⲁⲣⲓⲥⲧⲁⲩⲣⲱ ⲙⲙⲁ]ϥ A
ⲁϣϥ BO

τον βασιλεα υμων σταυρωσω TR
* ⲁⲣⲓⲥⲧⲁⲩⲣⲱ ⲙ[ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲣⲣⲟ] A
* ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲣⲟ ⲛⲧⲁⲁϣϥ BO

19:16 παρελαβον δε τον ιησουν και απηγαγον TR ℵ W
[παρ]αλ[αβοντες δε] αυτο[ν ηγαγο]ν p66
παρελαβον ουν τον ιησουν B BO

19:17 και βασταζων τον σταυρον αυτου εξηλθεν TR
* ⲁϥⲓ̈ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲡⲓϣⲃⲉ ⲧⲁⲗⲏⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲣⲟϥ BO

λεγομενον κρανιου TR
omit BO

19:18 εσταυρωσαν TR
* ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲁϣ" BO

αλλους δυο TR A
ⲁⲩⲓϣⲓ ... ⲛⲕⲉⲥⲟⲛⲓ BO

μεσον δε τον ιησουν TR A
ⲁⲩⲓϣⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ϧⲉⲛⲧⲟⲩⲙⲏϯ BO

19:19 εθηκεν TR BO
* ⲁϥⲧⲁⲥ" A

σταυρου TR
* ϣⲑⲉ BO

ιησους TR BO
ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲡ[ⲉ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅] A

19:20 τουτον ... τον τιτλον TR (P^{66}) ℵ B (A)
ⲙⲙⲟϥ BO
τοτε ... τον τιτλον W

εσταυρωθη ο ιησους TR (A)
ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲁϣϥ BO

19:21 των ιουδαιων (1) TR A
omit BO

εκεινος TR A
ⲛⲑⲟϥ BO

19:23 απεκριθη TR A
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ BO

γεγραφα (2) TR A
* ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲥϧⲏⲧϥ BO

19:23 οι ... στρατιωται οτε εσταυρωσιν TR (P^{66}) B W BO (ⲓϣⲓ for εσταυρωσιν)
οι στρατιωται οι εσταυρωσαντες ℵ A

τα ιματια αυτου TR BO
ⲡϥⲣϣⲱⲛ A

εκαστω στρατιωτη μερος TR A
ⲁⲩⲉⲗⲟⲩⲧⲟⲓ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲫⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛϫⲉⲛⲓⲙⲁⲧⲟⲓ BO

και τον χιτωνα TR B W A BO
omit ℵ

ο χιτων TR A

ϯϣθην ετεμαⲩ   BO

εκ των ανωθεν υφαντος δι ολου   TR BO
αλλα ΝΕⲩϹΑϨΤ̣Ϥ ΤΑⲩΤΕ   A

19:24 λαχωμεν περι αυτου τινος εσται   TR (A).
ΜΑΡΕΝϨΙⲰΠ ΕΡΟϹ ΤΕΝΝΑⲩ ϪΕΑϹΕΡΤΑΝΙΜ   BO

η λεγουσα   TR W
omit   ℵ B A BO

εαυτοις   TR ℵ B A BO
omit   W

μεν   TR
omit   A BO

19:25 σταυρω   TR A
* ϣθε   BO

του ιησους   TR ℵ B A BO
omit   (P66) W

η αδελφη της μητρος αυτου μαρια η του κλωπα   TR
[ΤϹⲰ]ΝΕ ΝΤΕϤΜΕΕⲩ ΜΑΡΙΑ ΤϢ[Ε]ΕΡΕ ΝΚΛⲰΠΑ   A
ΤϹⲰΝΙ ΝΤΕϤΜΑⲩ ΝΕΜΜΑΡΙΑ ϯΟⲩΙ ΝΤΕΚΛΟΠΑ   BO

19:26 ιησους ουν ιδων την μητερα   TR B W A BO
omit   ℵ

παρεστωτα   TR ℵ B A BO
omit   W

γυναι   TR BO
omit   A

19:27 εκεινης της ωρας   TR
ϕοοⲩ ΕΤΜ[Μ]Εⲩ   A
ΤΟΤΕ   BO

τα ιδια   TR
ΠϤΗΕΙ   A BO

19:28 ηδη   TR P^{66} ℵ B
omit   W A BO

ινα τελειωθη η γραφη   TR ℵ B W BO
omit P^{66} A

19:29 εκειτο   TR A
* ΝΕ... ΜΜΑⲩ   BO

οι... πλησαντες σπογγον οξους και υσσωπω περιθεντες TR
σπογγον... μεστον του οξους ωσσωπω περιθεντες (P^{66}) ℵ B W A
ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲗⲟ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲥⲫⲟⲛⲅⲟⲥ ⲉϥⲙⲉϩ ⲛϩⲉⲙϫ ⲉϫⲉⲛⲟⲩ ϩⲩⲥⲥⲱⲡⲟⲥ BO

19:30 ελαβε TR A
ⲉⲧⲁⲩϯ BO

ο ιησους TR B W A
omit ℵ BO

τετελεσται TR A
ⲁⲩϫⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ BO

19:31 ινα μη μεινη... επει παρασκευη ην TR
επει παρασκευη ην ινα μη μεινη επι του σταυρου τα σωματα
εν τω σαββατω ℵ B W A BO
ⲉⲡⲓⲇⲏ ⲛⲉⲡⲥⲱⲟⲩⲡⲉ ϩⲓⲛⲁ ϫⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲓⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲟϩⲓ ϩⲓⲡⲓϣⲑⲉ ϧⲉⲛⲡⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ
ⲛⲧⲉⲥⲁⲙⲃⲁⲑⲟⲛ BO

γαρ TR A
ϫⲉⲩⲏⲓ BO

η ημερα εκεινου του σαββατου TR ℵ W A BO
η ημερα εκεινη του σαββατου B

19:32 μεν TR
omit A BO

του συσταυρωθεντος αυτω TR (A)
* ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲁϣϥ ⲛⲉⲙⲁϥ BO

19:33 ειδον αυτον ηδη τεθνηκοτα TR A
* ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉⲁϥⲟⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲩ BO

19:34 εις των στρατιωτων TR
ⲟⲩⲉⲉ ϩⲛⲙⲙⲁⲧⲟⲉⲓ A
ⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϧⲉⲛⲛⲓⲙⲁⲧⲟⲓ BO

19:35 εκεινος TR (κακεινος) A
ⲛⲑⲟϥ BO

19:36 συντριβησεται TR
ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲕⲁϣϥ BO

αυτου TR B W BO
απ αυτου ℵ A

19:37 ετερα TR BO
omit A

19:38 expl. πιλατος, 20:3 inc. το μνημειον A

19:38 το σωμα του ιησου και επετρεψεν ηλθεν ουν... ηρε TR B
το σωμα του ιησου και επετρεψεν ο πιλατος ηλθον ουν ηραν ℵ W
omit (P^{66})
ⲡⲓⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲛⲧⲉⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲁϥϯⲉⲣϣⲓϣⲓ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛϫⲉⲡⲓⲗⲁⲧⲟⲥ ⲁϥⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ
ⲁϥⲱⲗⲓ BO

το σωμα του ιησου (2) TR
το σωμα αυτου (P^{66}) B
αυτον ℵ W
ⲡⲓⲥⲱⲙⲁ BO

19:39 τον ιησουν TR ℵ W BO
αυτον B

φερων TR (P^{66}) B BO
εχων ℵ W

μιγμα TR
ελιγμα ℵ B W
ⲙⲟⲩⲣ BO

19:40 εδησαν αυτο οθονιοις TR
* ⲁⲩⲕⲟⲥϥ ϧⲉⲛϩⲁⲛϩⲃⲱⲥ ⲛⲛⲓⲁⲩ BO

19:41 εν τω κηπω μνημειον TR
ⲛⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛⲟⲩⲙϩⲁⲩ ϧⲉⲛⲡⲓⲥⲱⲙ BO

ουδεις TR
ϩⲗⲓ ⲛⲣⲉϥⲙⲱⲟⲩⲧ BO

19:42 εκει TR
ⲁⲩⲭⲁϥ ⲛϧⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ BO

εθηκαν TR
ⲁⲩⲭⲱ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ BO

20:1 πρωι TR ℵ B BO
omit W

σκοτιας ετι ουσης TR
* ⲉⲧⲓ ⲉⲣⲉⲧⲭⲉⲙⲧⲥ ⲙⲃⲟⲗ BO

εκ του μνημειου TR (P^{66}) B
απο της θυρας εκ του μνημιου ℵ W BO

20:2 προς τον αλλον TR
omit BO

20:3 και ηρχοντο εις το μνημειον TR (P^{66}) B W
omit ℵ
* ⲁⲩⲓ ϣⲁⲡⲓⲙϩⲁⲩ BO

20:4 οι δυο ομου TR
* ⲡⲓⲃ̅ ϩⲓⲟⲩⲙⲁ BO

ο αλλος μαθητης TR B W
omit ℵ
ⲡⲓⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ BO

προεδραμε ταχιον του πετρου TR
ⲁ...ⲉⲣϫⲟϫⲓ ⲁϥⲉⲣϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ BO

20:5 ου μεντοι εισηλθεν TR (P^{66}) B W
ου αλλα εισηλθεν BO
omit ℵ

expl. εισηλθεν, 20:13 inc. λεγει A

20:7 χωρις TR
* ⲉϥⲭⲏ ⲥⲁⲡⲥⲁ BO

20:9 ηδεισαν TR B W BO
ηδει ℵ

20:10 ουν TR
ⲧⲟⲧⲉ BO

παλιν TR
omit BO

προς εαυτους TR
ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲏⲓ BO

20:11 προς TR B W BO
εν ℵ

εξω TR B W BO
omit ℵ

20:12 δυο TR B W BO
omit ℵ

εν λευκοις καθεζομενος TR
ⲉⲩϩⲉⲙⲥⲓ ϧⲉⲛϩⲁⲛϩⲃⲱⲥ ⲙⲫⲓⲣⲓ BO

20:13 εκεινοι TR
omit BO

κλαιεις TR (P^{66}) ℵ B W BO
κλαιεις τινα ζητεις D

20:14 εστραφη TR A
ⲁⲥⲕⲉⲧϩⲣⲁⲥ BO

20:15 αυτη ο ιησους TR A
omit BO

εκεινη TR
ⲦⲈⲈⲒ A
ⲚⲐⲞⲤ BO

δοκουσα TR A
* ⲚⲀⲤⲘⲈⲨⲒ BO

ει TR P^{66} ℵ B D A BO
omit W

20:16 λεγει TR A
ⲁϥⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱ . . . ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ BO

μαρια TR D
μαριαμ ℵ B W A BO

εκεινη TR BO
ⲚⲦⲀⲤ A

αυτω TR D
αυτω εβραιστι (P^{66}) ℵ B W A BO

διδασκαλε TR ℵ B W A BO
$\overline{\text{κε}}$ διδασκαλε D

20:17 γαρ TR
omit A

αναβαινω TR B D W A BO
ιδου αναβαινω ℵ

τον πατερα μου και πατερα υμων και θεον μου και θεον
υμων TR
* ϢⲀⲠⲀⲈⲒⲰⲦ ⲈⲦⲈⲠⲈⲦⲚⲈⲒⲰⲦⲠⲈ ⲀⲨⲰ ⲠⲀⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ ⲈⲦⲈⲠⲈⲦⲚⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈⲠⲈ A BO

20:18 μαρια TR D W BO
μαριαμ P^{66} ℵ B A

εωρακε TR D
εωρακα P^{66} ℵ B W A BO

ταυτα TR ℵ B W A BO
α D

αυτη TR P^{66} ℵ B W BO
[ΝΗ]ⲈⲒ A
αυτη εμηνυσεν αυτοις D

20:19 ουσης ... οψιας TR
* ⲚⲈⲢⲞⲨϨⲒ BO

τη ημερα TR
ⲘⲠⲒⲈϨⲞⲞⲨ ... ⲘⲠⲒⲈϨⲞⲞⲨ BO

τη μια των σαββατων TR BO
[Ⲧ]ⲔⲨⲢⲒⲀⲔⲎ A

των θυρων κεκλεισμενων TR
* ⲈⲚⲢⲰⲞⲨϪⲢⲀⲈ[ⲒⲦ] A
ⲚⲀⲢⲈⲚⲒⲢⲰⲞⲨ ⲘⲀϢⲐⲀⲘ BO

συνηγμενοι TR
omit ℵ B D W A BO

αυτοις TR P^{66} B D W A BO
omit ℵ

20:20 τουτο TR ℵ B D A BO
ταυτα W

οι μαθηται TR ℵ B W A BO
οι μαθηται αυτου D

20:21 αυτοις TR BO
omit A

ο ιησους TR B D
omit ℵ W A BO

καγω πεμπω υμας TR A
ⲠⲀⲒⲢⲎϮ ϨⲰ ϮⲞⲨⲞⲢⲠ ⲘⲘⲰⲦⲈⲚ BO

20:22 και (ι) TR
ⲆⲈ A

ενεφυσησε TR ℵ B W
ⲀϤⲚⲒϤⲈ ⲀϨⲞⲨⲚ ⲀⲠⲞⲨϨⲞ A BO
ενεφυσησε αυτοις D

λαβετε TR A
ϪⲒ ⲚⲰⲦⲈⲚ BO

20:23 αν τινων κρατητε TR B D W A
ⲈϢⲰⲠ ... ⲞⲚ ⲀⲢⲈⲦⲈⲚϢⲀⲦⲀϨⲚⲞ ⲚϨⲀⲚⲞⲨⲞⲚ BO
εαν ... τινων κρατηνται ℵ

κεκρατηνται TR
* ⲤⲈⲚⲀⲀⲘⲀ[ϨⲦ]Ⲉ ⲘⲘⲀⲨ A BO

20:24 θωμας ... εις TR A
ⲑⲱⲙⲁⲥ ... ⲛⲉⲟⲩⲁⲓ BO

20:25 αλλοι TR BDW
omit ℵ A BO

τον τυπον (1) TR ℵBDW BO
τους τυπους P^{66} A

και βαλω ... τον τυπον των ηλων TR
omit A

και βαλω τον δακτυλον ... εις τον τυπον των
ηλων ... πλευραν αυτου TR B W BO
και βαλω τον δακτυλον ... εις την χειραν αυτου ...
πλευραν αυτου ℵ
και βαλω ... πλευραν αυτου και βαλω ... εις τον
τυπον των ηλων D

20:26 και (1) TR
δε A

αυτου TR B D A
omit ℵ W BO

εστη TR A
ⲁϥⲟϩⲓ ⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ ⲛϫⲉⲓⲏ̅ⲥ̅ BO

ειπεν TR
[ⲡ]ⲁϫⲉϥ ... ⲁⲛ ⲛⲉⲩ A
ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ BO

20:27 ωδε TR
ⲁⲛⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ A
ⲉⲙⲛⲁⲓ BO

expl. μη γινου A

πιστος TR
* ϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲉⲕⲛⲁϩϯ BO

20:29 θωμα TR
omit ℵ B D W BO

ιδοντες TR B D W BO
ιδοντες με ℵ

20:30 μεν TR
omit BO

20:31 ο ιησους εστιν ο χριστος ο υιος του θεου TR ℵ B

ιησους ο χριστος εστιν ο υιος του θεου   D W
Ⲓ̅Ⲏ̅Ⲥ̅ⲠⲈ ⲠⲬ̅Ⲣ̅Ⲥ̅ ⲪⲀⲒⲠⲈ ⲠⲒϢⲎⲢⲒ ⲚⲦⲈⲪϮ   BO

ζωην   TR B W   BO
ζωην αιωνιον   ℵ D

εχητε   TR
ⲚⲦⲈⲦⲈⲚϪⲒ   BO

21:1 παλιν   TR
omit   BO

ο ιησους   TR ℵ B W   BO
omit   D

21:2 ησαν ομου   TR
* ⲚⲀⲨϨⲒⲞⲨⲘⲀ   BO

οι του ζεβεδαιου   TR P^{66} B W   BO
οι υιοι ζεβεδαιου   ℵ D

21:3 αυτοις   TR P^{66} ℵ B W   BO
τουτοις   D

ευθυς   TR
omit   ℵ B D W   BO

21:4 ηδη   TR B D W
omit   ℵ BO

ο ιησους εις τον αιγιαλον... ιησους εστι   TR ℵ B D BO
omit   W

μεντοι   TR
ⲆⲈ   BO

ηδεισαν   TR
* ⲚⲈⲘⲠⲞⲨⲈⲘⲒ sic   BO

ιησους εστι   TR
ⲠϬ̅Ⲥ̅ⲠⲈ Ⲓ̅Ⲏ̅Ⲥ̅   BO

21:5 ο ιησους   TR ℵ B D   BO
omit   W

21:6 μερη   TR
omit   BO

ευρησετε   TR ℵ B D W   BO
ευρησετε [οι δε ειπον δι] ολης νυκτος [εκοπιασαμεν κα]ι ουδε[ν]
ελαβ[ομεν επι δε τω σω ο]νομ[ατι βαλουμεν] P^{66}

ετι TR
omit BO

21:7 εστι (1) TR ℵ B W BO
εστι ημων D

εβαλεν εαυτον TR ℵ B W BO
ηλατο D

21:8 αλλοι μαθηται TR
ⲛⲓⲕⲉⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ . . . ⲉⲛⲁⲩϩⲓⲡⲓϫⲟⲓ BO

τω πλοιαριω TR B D W BO
τω αλλω πλοιαριω ℵ

21:9 ως . . . απεβησαν TR
ⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲓ . . . ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲓ BO

21:11 τοσουτων οντων TR
* ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲁⲓ ⲙⲏϣ ⲙⲙⲁ BO

21:12 λεγει TR
ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲟⲛ BO

ουδεις . . . ετολμα . . . εξετασαι TR
ⲛⲉⲙⲡⲉϩⲗⲓ . . . ϣⲉⲛ" BO

21:13 αρτον TR ℵ B W BO
αρτον ευχαριστησας D

21:14 ο ιησους TR ℵ B D BO
omit W

21:15 οτε . . . ηριστησαν TR
* ϩⲟⲧⲉ . . . ⲉⲧⲁⲩ<ⲟⲩ>ⲱ ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱⲙ BO

ιωνα TR
ιωαννου B D W BO
omit ℵ

πλειον τουτων TR ℵ B D
πλειον παντων τουτων W
omit BO

αυτω (1) TR
omit BO

αυτω (2) TR ℵ B W BO
αυτω ο ιησους D

αρνια TR ℵ B W BO

προβατα D

21:16 παλιν TR ℵ B W BO
omit D

δευτερον TR B W BO
omit ℵ
δευτερον ο κυριος D

ιωνα TR
ιωανου B D W BO
omit ℵ

ναι TR B D W BO
omit ℵ

21:17 ιωνα TR
ιωανου ℵ B D W BO

τριτον (2) TR ℵ B W BO
omit D

αυτω (3) TR ℵ D W BO
omit B

ο ιησους TR B
omit ℵ D W BO

21:18 τας χειρας TR B D W BO
τη χιραν ℵ

αλλος TR B
αλλοι ℵ D W BO

ζωσει TR B
ζωσουσιν ℵ D W BO

οισει TR B
αποισουσιν ℵ D W BO

ου TR ℵ B W BO
omit D

21:19 τουτο TR ℵ B W BO
ταυτα D

21:20 ον ηγαπα ο ιησους ακολουθουντα TR B D W
omit BO
ον ηγαπα ο ιησους ℵ

ανεπεσεν TR

* ⲛⲁϥⲣⲟⲧⲉⲃ BO

ειπε TR B
ειπε αυτω ℵ D W BO

21:21 λεγει τω ιησου TR ℵ B W BO
λεγει αυτω ιησου D

κυριε TR B D W BO
omit ℵ

ουτος ... τι TR
* ⲫⲁⲓ ⲛⲑⲟϥ ⲁϥⲛⲁⲉⲣⲟȣ BO

21:22 μενειν TR ℵ B W
* ⲉⲭⲁ" BO
μενειν ουτως D

21:23 εξηλθεν TR
* ⲁ... ⲥⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ BO

αδελφους TR ℵ B W BO
αδελφους και εδοξαν D

αυτω TR ℵ B W BO
αυτο D

μενειν TR
* ⲉⲭⲁ" BO

τι προς σε TR B W BO (ⲁϩⲟⲕ ⲛⲑⲟⲕ)
omit ℵ
προς σε D

21:24 ο μαρτυρων TR
ⲉⲧⲁϥⲉⲣⲙⲉⲧⲣⲉ BO

περι TR
* ⲛ' BO

ταυτα TR
-ⲟȣ BO

21:25 omits entire verse ℵ

ιησους TR B W
χριστος ιησους D BO (ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲭⲣ̅ⲥ̅)

οιμαι TR
* ϯϫⲱ BO

χωρησαι TR
* ⲛⲁϣⲉⲣⲭⲱⲣⲓⲛ BO

αμην TR
omit BDW BO

no subscription TR D
ευαγγελιον κατα ιωαννην ℵ BO
κατα ιωανην B W

Appendix II

INDEX OF VERSE REFERENCES IN CHAPTER II

John

2:17 70, 155c
22 73b, 140
23 147b
25 140

3: 2 12a, 16a, 180a, 205a
3 205a
4 21b, 205a, 208a
5 205a
6 164b
7 202a
8 9b, 14a, 164
9 208a
11 11b, 163d
13 78d
14 202a
15 16c
16 16c, 71b
18 2a
20 1c, 16c
21 1c, 198b

4: 6 164a
7 3a
8 171a, 182d
9 1c
10 15c, 61c, 172b
11 16e
12 73d
4:13 16c
14 114a, 184a
18 11b
21 110, 116e
22 11b, 22a
23 17a, 110, 116e
24 17c, 202a,c
25 16e,f
26 15d
29 73a,b
30 145, 202e
31 86a, 142a
32 12i
34 78d
35 10d
36 2a, 48a
38 101, 160, 163e
39 18a, 73a
40 123c, 142b
45 73a, 97a, 166a, 240
46 76a, 147b
47 3a, 86a, 142a, 213b
48 122b, 184a
50 73b
52 75c, 86a
53 75c
54 72

5: 1 240

5: 2 16e, 37a
4 2c
5 20, 99c
6 20
7 1c, 128, 186b
9 239g
11 71c, 78b
12 86a
13 62b, 78b
14 3a, 183b
15 79
18 26d, 144b, 146
19 2c, 23g, 122a, 177i, 181b, 205c
20 12a
21 2c, 10b, 11b, 23d, 45a
22 2c
23 10a, 80a
24 19b, 48a, 78c
25 81c, 110, 116a
26 10b, 71b
29 54d, 80b
30 10a, 78d, 127b, 205a
31 177e
32 12a, 13d, 15d
34 22a
35 16e
36 12a,d, 71c, 73b
37 101, 160
38 54f, 73d
41 54f
43 5a, 29a, 54h, 185c
44 206b
45 17a, 110, 163g
46 137b, 139
47 108b, 117

6: 2 147b
3 142c
4 150
5 40a, 108b
6 41a,b, 143, 172a, 215
7 23a
9 2b, 12a, 126
12 80d
6:13 52, 55, 58a, 73b 169
14 16e, 73b, 105b
15 119, 213a
17 90, 97b, 145, 171a, 241
18 91a
19 3a, 21d, 105b, 164a
21 147c
22 49b, 71c, 144b, 167d
23 76a, 81a, 106a
24 105b
25 85a, 155b
26 36a, 37c, 67, 106a
27 17a,b, 48c, 71d, 101
28 10f
29 75c
30 10d
31 196b
32 10d, 48f, 101, 160
33 15d, 25
35 116b
36 2e, 23b, 36b, 157b
37 12b, 22e, 103a, 109a, 116a
38 78d, 123b, 155b
39 78d, 96, 163b, 183b
40 48b
41 80a
42 12i, 22a, 56a, 149
44 80a, 116a, 122a, 187a, 205c
45 22e, 80a, 104, 116a, 196a
46 101, 160
50 16e, 54a, 131, 183b
51 12d,e, 16e, 29a, 80a, 114a, 116a, 185c
52 206b
53 122b
54 48a
56 2a, 23b, 48a
57 16e, 71a
58 17a, 71a, 80a
60 10f, 208c
61 10d, 45b, 57b
62 49a, 177e

6:63 9c, 54c,e
64 15c, 53b, 115a, 172a
65 122a, 201a, 205b
66 89a
68 13d, 108b
70 71c, 101
71 58b, 214

7: 2 150
3 12a
4 1c
6 6a, 151
7 205c
8 6b, 152, 228
14 27b
15 222
22 220
25 220
27 2a
28 37c, 79, 155b
30 152
31 70, 185c
33 2a, 13d, 46
34 2a, 14a, 205e
36 2a, 14a, 73b, 205e
37 65, 86b, 172d, 177h
38 116a
39 54b, 216a
40 26d, 55
41 26c
42 36d, 49a, 64, 147b
47 155d
49 16e, 22a
50 80b
51 14d, 23a, 122a, 187a
52 37c, 157a, 231

8:12 17a,c, 68, 116a
13 10d, 47d
14 14c, 177e
15 22a, 54f
16 80d, 177e
17 155c
18 10e, 15c
19 149, 171c, 172b
8:20 152
21 2a, 14b, 206e
22 108b, 2a, 14b, 205e
24 122b
25 32, 149
26 13d, 22a, 32, 73d, 79
27 143
28 10d, 13d, 71a, 185c
31 164c, 177e
35 2c, 23d
36 112b, 185a
38 10d, 34, 163f
39 37c, 137b
40 12d, 73b, 99a, 163a
41 56a
42 71c, 137b, 155b
43 54h, 205a
44 1c, 22d, 128
46 2a, 13d, 22a
47 1c
48 22a, 37c
50 17c, 22a
51 116b, 186a
52 116a, 186a
53 22b, 73d
54 16e, 177e
55 185a
56 183f
57 6a

9: 2 71c, 93
4 6c, 78d, 202a,b, 207
7 12i, 42a, 45a, 165a
8 49c, 149
9 149
11 12h, 37a, 71c, 101
13 3a, 49d, 147a
14 77a, 107
15 5a, 105a, 142b
16 26d, 205c
17 47c
18 63a, 66a, 78d, 154
19 8a, 12a
21 4, 47e, 71c
22 105a, 130c, 171a

9:23 4, 47e
24 49d, 147a
25 15b, 21a
26 71d
27 10d, 22a, 56a
28 22b, 37c
30 10d, 37c, 45b, 57a, 239f
31 1c, 41a, 180b
32 165b, 166a,b
33 138a, 204b, 208c
34 10f, 37c, 135
35 85b
36 121
41 43a, 137c, 138a

10: 1 56c,e
3 1c, 22d, 56b
4 1c, 185c
5 23d, 56d,f, 189
6 59
8 73a
9 116a, 130b
10 1c
11 1c, 22d
12 1c, 12g, 30
15 2c,d, 10a, 23b
16 12a, 202a,d
17 2c,d
18 10d, 22d
20 22a, 56a
21 26d, 55, 205a
22 239g
24 6d, 55
25 10d, 12a
27 1c, 2c,d, 23d
28 2c, 108b, 184a
29 163a, 205c
32 117
33 2b
34 196a
35 73d, 75c, 205b
36 75a
38 122b, 177d
40 49a, 147b
41 73a, 144a

11: 1 197b
2 13c, 49d, 79
3 11b
4 85b
6 147b
7 178
8 2a
9 1c, 8b, 26a, 177e
10 1c, 177e
11 2a, 117
12 192c
13 36e, 142d
15 178
16 16b, 45b, 119, 178
17 85b
19 92, 171a
21 29a, 138a, 171c
22 191c
25 185b
26 16c, 19b, 116b
27 45c, 155d
28 44a
29 3a
30 76a, 171b
31 2b, 16e, 49b, 123b
32 29a, 49a, 61a, 138a
33 80d
34 155b, 231
36 145, 149
37 80a, 204c, 205a
38 3a, 38a,e, 55, 146
39 5a,c, 99c, 100
40 185a
42 26b, 71c, 167d, 172b
44 123d, 164b, 168a, 174
45 12e, 75b, 102
46 75b
47 2a, 10f
48 185a
50 119
51 38f, 68, 213c
52 50a, 167c, 187b
54 241
55 150
56 13d, 55, 168a, 190a

11:57 130c, 171a, 185a
12: 1 49a, 91d, 164c
2 153
3 91f,g
4 216b
5 239f
6 38d, 41a,b, 125, 144a, 146
7 120
9 12c, 73c
11 28a
12 80b, 101
13 38d, 146, 241
14 85b, 196b
15 40b
16 16e, 71d, 91b, 101, 198b
17 16e, 66c, 142a
18 91c
20 123b
21 42b, 142a
22 3a
24 1c, 82a, 122b, 185a
25 17c
26 14b, 29b, 117, 130a, 177f
27 193
28 54g, 70
29 81b, 160, 164c, 167d
30 37c, 155b
32 185a
33 212
34 2a, 202a,d
35 7, 22d, 46, 183b
38 12c, 71c, 73c
39 204d, 205c
40 183b
42 183b
44 78d
46 16c, 48a, 183c
47 2a, 66b, 123b, 134, 136, 142a, 150b, 185a
48 13d, 54d
49 71c, 80d, 101, 193
50 10c, 15a, 159

13: 2 166a,c
3 22f
4 3a
5 43d, 200
6 3a, 10f
7 11b
8 122b
10 164b
11 17a, 172a
12 233
14 203b
16 78a
17 177e
18 10d, 45b, 75b
19 185c
21 111
23 197a
24 123c, 195
26 3a, 81c, 114b
27 11b
28 78d, 91e
29 3a, 33, 146
33 14a, 48f, 57c, 205e
35 177f
36 14a, 45c, 206e
37 206e
38 108b, 191

14: 2 2a, 61a, 123c
3 14a, 109b
4 14a, 45c, 48e
5 22f, 208b
6 122, 209
7 24, 98, 124, 156, 173
8 9a
9 164b
10 16e,f
12 2b, 12a, 117
13 192a
14 130a
15 37b, 177f, 184a, 190b
17 2a, 117, 205d
19 2a
21 19b, 116a
22 211

14:23 22e, 109a,b, 116a, 130a, 133
24 2c, 12a, 36c,d, 80d
25 94b, 158
26 12d, 77c, 103b, 114a, 129
28 2a, 29a, 61a, 138a
29 185c
30 23a
31 10c, 13c, 53a, 71a, 178

15: 2 2c, 12f, 17c,d,e
3 3b, 163a
4 122a,c, 187a, 206d,f
5 1c, 127a, 206a
6 2a, 23d,e,f, 122b, 132
7 48d, 108c, 185a
8 108b
9 71a
10 159
12 71a
14 11b, 177e
15 2c, 13d, 14d, 36c, 74
16 71c, 101, 192a
17 123b
19 137b, 138a
20 73b
21 78c, 108b
22 62a
24 62a, 163a, 210
25 167b
26 12a,c,d, 114a, 129, 185c

16: 1 183b
2 17c,d, 96, 187c
3 116c
4 185c
5 2b, 22f, 78d, 117
7 5a, 22e, 54h, 109a, 122b, 185a
8 82b
9 54f
10 2a, 117
12 206a,g
16:13 17c, 45c, 108b, 116a,c, 194
14 108b, 129
15 12a
16 2a, 24, 37d, 109c
17 2a, 12a, 51, 109c, 117
18 12a, 13d, 47c, 149
19 2a, 89b, 109c, 217
21 1c, 22d, 43b, 95, 179, 184c
22 2a, 31a, 116a
23 116a, 192a
24 63b, 201b
25 31b, 108b, 116d
26 2e, 23b, 111, 116a
27 69
28 2a
30 6a,b, 54h
32 23c, 184c
33 109d

17: 1 37c
2 71a, 163b
3 75b
4 123b, 163a
5 49d, 147b
6 12d, 144a, 163a
7 163b
8 71c, 163a
9 22a, 163b
10 22a, 35, 155d
12 26e, 67, 73b, 94a
13 22a, 168b
18 71a
19 201b
20 115b
21 71a
22 163a
23 160, 201b
25 54i, 71c
26 73b

18: 1 43c, 49a, 75c
2 17c,d, 87, 172a
3 3a

18: 4 16d, 38c, 45c
5 12e, 17c,d,e, 172c
8 10d, 123d
9 73b,d, 163c
10 38c
11 163a, 184a
14 28b, 80c, 123c, 144a
16 49d, 147b, 172c
18 38e, 44c, 146, 166a, 172c, 198a,c
19 86a
20 14a, 27a, 45a, 68
21 10d, 13c, 45b, 75b, 77b, 164b
23 22a
24 168a
25 198a,c
26 71c, 75d, 101
28 3a, 183b
29 10d, 13d
30 61a,b, 138b
31 203a
32 73b, 211
34 47c, 71c
35 71c,d
36 137b, 138a, 183b
37 1c, 10d, 16c, 155b
39 113, 123a, 182b
40 38d

19: 2 185a
3 38d, 146
4 5a,d, 88
10 2a, 23b
11 18b, 145, 199a
15 86b, 112a
18 76a
19 198a
20 76a, 198a
21 71c, 101, 149
22 163d
23 77a
24 31b, 108b, 188
25 172c
26 49d, 168a
31 183b
19:32 80a
33 99b, 166a,c
35 13d, 47a, 164b
38 21c, 44b
41 227a

20: 3 222b
5 225a
9 202d, 227b
11 224, 226
13 76c
14 3a, 168a, 172a
15 38a, 71c, 101
16 45a
17 2c, 152
18 3a, 21e
19 39, 49a, 50b, 168a
21 71a
23 2a,c, 130d, 157a, 181a
24 45b
25 122b
26 3a, 168a
31 230

21: 3 225a
12 231
14 232
15 233
17 225b
18 221, 224
20 223
22 228
23 225b
24 229a
25 234

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Edwin A. *Johannine Grammar*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906.

Abbott-Smith, G. *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*. 3rd ed. rev. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Aland, Kurt, *et al*. (eds.). *The Greek New Testament*. New York: The American Bible Society, 1966.

Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. London: S. P. C. K., 1958.

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and adapted from the 4th revised and augmented edition by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated from the 9th-10th edition by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Böhlig, Alexander. "Griechische Deponentien im Koptischen," *Aegyptus*, XXXIII (1953), 91-96.

________. *Untersuchungen über die Koptischen Proverbientexte*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1936.

Chaine, M. Eléments de grammaire dialectale copte. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1933.

Clark, Kenneth Willis. "The Text of the Gospel of John in Third-Century Egypt," Novum Testamentum, V (1962), 16-24.

Cramer, Maria. Koptische Paläographie. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964.

Crum, W. E. A Coptic Dictionary. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1939.

Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantey. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Draguet, René. Index copte et grec-copte de la concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique. ("Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium: Subsidia," vol. XVI.) Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1960.

Du Bourguet, P. "Quelques dérogations aux 'règles' de la grammaire copte," Bulletin de la société d'archéologie copte, XVII (1963-1964), 13-21.

Feine, Paul, Johannes Behm, and Werner Georg Kümmel. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. 14th ed. rev. New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Field, Frederick. Notes on the Translation of the New Testament. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1899.

Garitte, G. Review of Papyrus Bodmer III: Évangile de Jean et Genèse I-IV, 2, edited by Rodolphe Kasser. Le Muséon, LXXIII (1960), 437-439.

Gehman, Henry S. "The Sahidic and the Bohairic Versions of the Book of Daniel," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVI (1927), 279-330.

Gregory, Caspar René. Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes. 3 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909.

3

Kasser, Rodolphe. "A propos des différentes formes du conditionnel copte," *Le Muséon*, LXXVI (1963), 267-270.

________. "Le Papyrus Bodmer III et les versions bibliques coptes," *Le Muséon*, LXXIV (1961), 423-433.

________. "Les dialectes coptes et les versions bibliques coptes," *Biblica*, XLVI (1965), 287-310.

________. *L'Évangile selon saint Jean et les versions coptes de la Bible*. Neuchâtel, Suisse: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1966.

________ (ed.). *Papyrus Bodmer III: Évangile de Jean et Genèse I-IV, 2*. ("Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium: Scriptores Coptici," vols. XXV-XXVI.) Louvain: Secrétariat de Corpus SCO, 1958.

Kenyon, Frederic G. *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.

________. "Hesychius and the Text of the New Testament," *Memorial Lagrange* (1940), pp. 245-250.

________. *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Kilpatrick, George D. "The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection of Biblical and Christian Texts," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, IV (1963), 33-47.

________. "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XLIV (1943), 24-36.

Klijn, A. F. J. "Papyrus Bodmer II (John I-XIV) and the Text of Egypt," *New Testament Studies*, III (1957), 327-334.

Koole, Jan Leunis. *Studien zum Koptischen Bibeltext*. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1936.

Grossouw, Willem. "De Koptische Bijbelvertalingen," *Studia Catholica*, IX (1933), 325-353.

________. *The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1938.

Hedley, P. L. "The Egyptian Texts of the Gospels and Acts," *Church Quarterly Review*, CXVIII (1934), 23-39, 188-230.

Horner, George W. *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*. 4 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1898-1905.

________. *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect*. 7 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1911-1924.

Houghton, Herbert Pierrepont. "The Coptic Sentence," *Aegyptus*, XXXVII (1957), 226-242.

Husselman, Elinor M. (ed.). *The Gospel of John in Fayumic Coptic*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, 1962.

Hyvernat, H. "Étude sur les versions coptes de la Bible," *Revue biblique*, V (1896), 427-433, 540-569; VI (1897), 48-74.

Jernstedt, P. "Die grammatische und lexikalische Stellung des koptischen Verbums ⲛⲁ 'gehen,'" *Doklady Akademiia Nauk SSSR* (1927), pp. 33-35.

Joussen, Anton. *Die Koptischen Versionen der Apostelgeschichte*. Bonn: Published by the author, 1963.

Kahle, Paul E. (ed.). *Bala'izah: Coptic Texts from Deir El-Bala'izah in Upper Egypt*. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.

ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲏ ⲇⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1873.

Kammerer, W. *A Coptic Bibliography*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, 1950.

Kuhn, K. H. Review of *Papyrus Bodmer III: Évangile de Jean et Genèse I-IV, 2*, edited by Rodolphe Kasser. *Journal of Theological Studies*, X (1959), 363-368.

Lagrange, P. M.-J. *Critique textuelle*. ("Introduction à l'étude du Nouveau Testament," vol. II.) Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1935.

Lefort, L. Th. "Le Copte Source auxiliaire du Grec," *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales*, II (1934), 569-578.

Mallon, Alexis. *Grammaire copte*. 4th ed. rev. Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1956.

Martin, Victor (ed.). *Papyrus Bodmer II*. Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956.

________ (ed.). *Papyrus Bodmer II: Supplement*. Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958.

________, and Rodolphe Kasser (eds.). *Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV*. 2 vols. Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961.

Metzger, Bruce M. "Recent Discoveries and Investigations of New Testament Manuscripts," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVIII (1959), 13-20.

________. *The Text of the New Testament*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Moulton, James Hope, William Francis Howard, and Nigel Turner. *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek*. 3 vols. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908-1963.

Nestle, Eberhard, and Kurt Aland (eds.). *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 25th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.

Parvis, Merrill M., and Allen P. Wikgren (eds.). *New Testament Manuscript Studies*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Payne, J. Barton. "Characteristics of Coptic Bible Translation," *The Asbury Seminarian*, V (1950), 64-66.

Petersen, Theodore. "The Biblical Scholar's Concern with Coptic Studies," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIII (1961), 241-249.

Plumley, J. Martin. An Introductory Coptic Grammar. London: Horne and van Thal., 1948.

Polotsky, H. J. Études de syntaxe copte. Le Caire: Publications de la société d'archéologie copte, 1944.

________. "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Koptischen," Orientalia, XXXI (1962), 413-430.

________. "The Coptic Conjugation System," Orientalia, XIX (1960), 392-422.

Porter, Calvin Lewis. "A Textual Analysis of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the Gospel of John." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1961.

________. "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P^{75}) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXI (1962), 363-376.

Roberts, C. H. "The Codex," Proceedings of the British Academy, XL (1954), 169-204.

Robertson, Archibald Thomas. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1914.

________. Word Pictures in the New Testament. 6 vols. New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1932.

Ropes, James Hardy. The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1926.

Sanders, Henry A. The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels. ("The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection.") New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912.

Schmidt, Carl. "Die Urschrift der Pistis Sophia," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXIV (1925), 218-240.

Simon, Jean. "Note sur le dossier des textes subakhmimiques," *Le Muséon*, LIX (1946), 497-509.

________. "Repertoire des bibliotheques publiques et privées contenant des manuscripts coptes," *Le Muséon*, XLIV (1931), 137-151.

Soden, Hermann von. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1911.

Stegemann, Victor. *Koptische Paläographie*. Heidelberg, 1936.

Steindorff, Georg. *Kurzer Abriss der Koptischen Grammatik*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagbuchhandlung, 1964.

Steindorff, Georg. *Lehrbuch der Koptischen Grammatik*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Svensson, Arvid. *Zum Gebauch der erzählenden Tempora im Grieschischen*. Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Buchdruckerei, 1930.

Thompson, Herbert (ed.). *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932.

________ (ed.). *The Gospel of St. John According to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript*. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1924.

Till, Walter C. "Coptic and Its Value," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XL (1957), 229-258.

________. "Coptic Biblical Texts Published after Vaschalde's Lists," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XLII (1959), 220-240.

________. "Das Koptische: Heutiger Stand der Forschung," *Orbis*, III (1954), 486-497.

Till, Walter C. *Koptische Dialektgrammatik*. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1931.

________. *Koptische Grammatik (Saïdishcher Dialekt)*. 3rd ed. rev. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1966.

Tischendorf, Constantinus. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 2 vols. 8th ed. Lipsiae: Giesecke and Devrient, 1869.

Vaschalde, A. "Ce qui a été publié des versions coptes de la Bible," *Le Muséon*, XLIII (1930), 409-431; XLV (1932), 117-156; XLVI (1933), 299-313.

________. "Ce qui a été publié des versions coptes de la Bible," *Revue biblique*, XXVIII (1919), 220-243, 513-531; XXIX (1920), 91-106, 241-258; XXX (1921), 237-246; XXXI (1922), 81-88, 243-258.

Vergote, J. "La Phrase nominale en copte," *Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute*, II (1950), 229-242.

Vööbus, Arthur. *Early Versions of the New Testament*. Stockholm, 1954.

Weigandt, Peter. "Zum Text von Joh. X, 7: ein Beitrag zum Problem der Koptischen Bibelübersetzung," *Novum Testamentum*, IX (1967), 43-51.

Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort (eds.). *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1881.

Westendorf, Wolfhart. *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1965.

Wikgren, Allen. "The Use of the Versions in New Testament Textual Criticism," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVII (1948), 135-142.

Willis, William H. "The New Collection of Papyri at the University of Mississippi," *Proceedings of the IX International Congress of Papyrology* (1961), pp. 381-392.

Wilmet, Michel. Concordance du Nouveau Testament Sahidique. ("Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium: Subsidia," vols. XI, XIII, XV.) Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1957, 1958, 1959.

Worrell, William H. A Short Account of the Copts. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1945.

________. Coptic Sounds. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1934.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

I was born the second son of a Lutheran minister on April 13, 1939, in Columbia, South Carolina. My earliest years were spent with my family in two small South Carolina towns. When I was nine years of age my family moved to Bradenton, Florida, where I graduated from high school. I received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Lenoir Rhyne College in 1961 and the Bachelor of Divinity degree from Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary in 1965. My seminary experience included a year as a student intern at Beth-Eden Lutheran Church in Newton, North Carolina. In June, 1962, I married Mary Shulenburger. I entered Duke University as a graduate student in the Department of Religion in the fall of 1965. As a graduate student at Duke during the 1966-1967 school year I served as a research assistant for the International Greek New Testament Project. In 1967-1968 I was the recipient of a Gurney Harriss Kearns Fellowship.